

ON CAPITALISM AND SOCIALISM

=====

Editorial

The world is passing through a momentous period. The sea is changing. Old opposites like Capitalism and Socialism, East and West are no longer as sharp in their mutual oppositions as they used to be.

On the face of it the claim made by some advocates of militarism and market economy seems to have been vindicated. These militarists think that it is the west's Superior Military strength and Uncompromising corporationism that have finally brought the Soviet Union to the negotiating table. This argument can be used for prolonging and augmenting military strength and thereby filling the coffers of the defence contractors and their dependants.

Look, they say, both China and Soviet Union have recognized the superiority of Capitalism and introduced Capitalism with its profit motive, market mechanism and private ownership of the means of production, inside their so-called socialist economies. These two big socialist powers have recognized that Capitalist technology is superior, and are now keen to acquire that technology at the cost of some compromise with Capitalism. Socialism has thus failed, according to them.

So, they say, it is not Capitalism that is riddled with Contradictions, as the socialists used to claim; it is socialism that has proved to be unviable and admitted defeat, according to these capitalist militarists.

The facts, however, are enormously more complex. Both systems have for a long time not been so faithful to their own principles. Free enterprise has never been really free. Monopoly or oligopoly capital could always restrain the small entrepreneur. The Banking and Finance oligopoly has been able to dominate and manipulate all the market economies. Tariff walls and protectionist measures have massively interfered with international free enterprise. Free enterprise capitalism is a myth. Long ago it incorporated many socialist measures like productivity bonuses, worker ownership of shares, greater role for trade unions, less inequality in wages, and worker welfare programmes. Despite large scale tax evasion, the private sector has always in market economy countries, contributed through taxes, for social welfare for the people. There is no pure uncompromising capitalism anywhere. Capitalism admitted defeat before Socialism in many areas, and incorporated Socialist elements into it.

Socialism on the other hand, is little more than two generation old. It has only recently acquired sufficient stability and security to afford some self-criticism. Marxist Socialism did not begin to be established in industrially advanced societies as Marx & Engels had predicted. The idea that technological progress would automatically bring about changes in the direction of socialism has not been vindicated by experience.

Socialist economies came into being in the Soviet Union and in China, neither of which was particularly advanced in science-technology or modernised industry at the time of its revolution. So much has depended on personalities like Lenin, Mao, Stalin and Deng-Xiaoping than on developments in forces of production.

And socialism, besieged by a Capitalism bent on its destruction, slipped too easily into ^{an} undemocratic efforts, which clearly is a violation of basic socialist principles.

The question is neither idle nor academic: Which is the worse compromise for socialism, failure of democracy leading to infernal inhumanity, or temporary acceptance of market economy principles inside a socialist economy? Both are bad, but ^{the} first is worse, many liberals would ^{concur}. If socialism is basically a humanism then the total denial of democratic human rights cannot be justified. If socialism makes people into moronic robots who think ^{what} about the party thinks and do what the party tells them to do, then it is no longer socialism.

The other side of the coin is that despite ^{colossal} failure in the area of the rights to protest or to organize resistance, the socialist economies have a very creditable record in providing more or less full employment, in eliminating total poverty, and in ensuring for all some basic human needs like food, shelter, clothing, transportation, education and health-care.

True, there is large scale unemployment in China, but compared to pre-revolutionary China with its graft and corruption, deceit and dehumanisation, People's China has been a monumental improvement of the conditions of life for the masses.

Why then the present uprising in that great land? We give a tentative answer to that question elsewhere in these columns. The important thing to note is that democratisation of a socialist society is always problematic. The essence of socialism is that the people control their own economic and cultural activity in a socially organized manner. In all socialist economies this social organization of economic activity has been achieved only by the dictatorship of the party (not of the proletariat). And the party has always developed a special commentary on Marxist - Leninist scriptures which justify that dictatorship and indicates the prevailing party line (See our article on the commentary Tradition in Judaism)

The three-tiered hierarchy of Party, state and people has become undemocratic in all existing socialist economies. How to democralise this hierarchy, without losing social cohesion and mobility, is the key question facing all socialist countries. The process will certainly take some time and may most likely cost some blood. But the process is inevitable. A democratic socialism (not social democracy as it now exists) is the only hope for humanity. Wherever there are historic movements in that direction, all people of goodwill should support that.

Gorbachob's Soviet Union has initiated the process of democratisation in a big way. China will find it more difficult after the brutal suppression of the student revolt; but with new leadership, China will have to lead the difficult path of democratisation.

What about the future ? From a superficial perspective, Socialism seems to be in shambles and Capitalism gloriously triumphant. But this is only a superficial perspective.

The internal contradictions of Capitalism are still mountainous. It's survival ~~is~~ now dependent on finding new non-military markets, without which it cannot afford to demilitarize. And the military posture, if it does not change, will bring about the economic and political destruction of both market economies and socialist economies.

The present strategy of many market economy nations is to capture that market by strategic use of military and economic power. The market is where the people are. And more than 80 percent of the non-saturated markets are in Asia, America, Western Europe and Japan - the Trilateral powers who bestride the world market economy - have very little possibility of expansion in their own saturated domestic markets. They all have to look to Asia for their future.

History is shifting towards the Asian mainland and it's oceans - the Indian and the Pacific. A.P.R. or the Asia - Pacific Region is the theatre of international action now.

The contest between Socialism and Capitalism will take new forms in Asia -Pacific theatre. America will be in that theatre as a pacific nation. Japan and China are fully Asia - Pacific. The Soviet Union is also Asia - Pacific. India is no big power - as yet. Western Europe is the only total outsider to the Asia - Pacific Region, but economic interests are bound to draw them into the region.

" Asian Development " looms large in the U.S. Administration's Policy; so does it in the development plans of Japan and the Soviet Union. And China, of course, is in the thick of it. The struggle between socialism and capitalism will largely be fought in the Asia - Pacific theatre.

(A) 1-7
crises in capitalism and ⁱⁿ socialism as well
(Paulo Gregorio
Metropolitan of Delhi) 1/5

"Crisis of capitalism" has by now become a disgustingly well-worn cliché. Ever since Karl Marx popularised the phrase in the middle of the last century, capitalism has ^{in fact} outlived many crises and emerged out of each one stronger than before. So much so that many Capitalists, not only in the west, but also in my country, ^{India}, do sincerely believe ^{keep} that it is Socialism that is now in crisis, and hope that ~~it~~ ^{socialism} will not outlive the present crisis. I shall certainly say a word also about the crisis in Socialism but let me first seek to present my imperfect understanding of both the perennial and the current crises in capitalism, mainly in order that I may benefit from your comments.

Capitalism has, as a system, an inherent perennial crisis, ^{built into it.} It has ^{certainly} also faced a number of different kinds of other crises, as it has developed through successive stages, and come to the final stage of imperialism, which has marked it for the past 200 years or more. Within that final stage of imperialism, it entered a new stage with the end of the second world war - in the second half of this century; whether or not it ~~has~~ ^{has} now ~~in the~~ ^{emerged from} ~~process of entering~~ yet another ^{crisis} ~~new stage~~ within neo-colonialist imperialism, ^{i.e. the crisis of the seventies,} we should examine in this lecture.

The rate of inflation cuts into the real earnings of the worker, despite all trade union activity and government populism. The capitalist system cannot survive unless it makes each labourer produce the surplus value necessary not only for capital investment but also for a high rate of profit on huge investments. There is no way for Capitalism to get out of this perennial crisis situation. It dooms the system itself in the long run; but so long as there is no viable alternative, the system will perpetuate itself by all sorts of means.

But Marx ^{or Engels} should not be misunderstood as having (See page

2. The First Historical Basis of Capitalism - The Rise of the Socialist State.

It is interesting to observe how the Capitalist system develops a high degree of robustness by facing and overcoming crises. The way it has faced and outlived two major historical Crises reveals its ^{temporary} inner strength as well as its ultimate weakness.

The first major crisis in history that the Capitalist system had to face was the appearance in history of a concrete viable alternative - the emergence of Russia as a socialist power controlled not by the owners of private property but by the working class. Of course it was not an advanced Capitalist country like Britain or Germany that first became Socialist. This shows that there is no strictly pre-determined sequence by which Capitalist societies become socialist. But the presence of Russia as a socialist power, precisely at the time when the Capitalist nations of the west were in the throes of the First world war, soon to emerge victorious.

But Marx or Engels should not be misunderstood as having taught that under-consumption by the poorer sectors of society explains the ^{perennial} Capitalist Crisis. That Crisis has to do very specifically ^{with} the Capitalist mode of production, and not just ^{with} the existence of the poor which has been there also in pre-Capitalist societies. *

Marx's argument is that surplus value is the source of profit for the Capitalist. Increased wages reduces surplus value. So if the Capitalist, in order to increase the purchasing power of the worker, ^{so as to sell all he produces,} raises his wages, ^{would but actually} cuts into his own profit margin. This is the contradiction.

The State can often intervene as a consumer to increase the level of demand, but that does not resolve the contradiction that to raise wages is to reduce profit - of course assuming that other things remain constant.

On this see John Weeks, "The Sphere of Production and the Analysis of Crisis in Capitalism" in Science and Society Vol XL1. No. 3. Fall, 1977

pp 281 ff. ~~And~~ K. Marx, Capital Vol II, pp 414-415
also F. Engels Anti-Dühring, London, 1962, pp 393-394
nature of

1. The Perennial Crisis of Capitalism

According to Karl Marx, the system of market economy Capitalism, or if to use the more glorified term, that of free enterprise and private ownership of the means of production, demonstrates within itself an inherent contradiction which belongs to its very nature.

Marx has clearly shown, at least in a theoretical frame, how the Capitalist producer's primary aim is to keep the wages of the worker to the minimum possible, and to maximise his profit by simultaneously increasing the efficiency of the forces of production (say machinery, technology etc) and keeping the wage level as low as possible. This means that the Capitalist system ~~does not~~ encourages ~~full~~ unemployment in order that the labour market can be ^{kept} competitive and ^{so that} the labourer is ^{always} under pressure to sell his labour to the producer for less than its worth ~~or~~ ~~production value~~. This seems fairly obvious. Marx also argued that by keeping the labourer's wages low, the producer is reducing the purchasing capacity of the worker and thereby harming his own market. This latter argument has been weakened by two developments - the growth of trade unions and their partial success in fighting for higher wages, and the pressure under which the state which largely serves the interest of the Capitalist is forced by the exigencies of the "democratic system" to stand for a more egalitarian society. Despite much

The reconstruction of the Capitalist Countries, however, was assisted in the three decades after the First world war by the possibility of plunder and more systematically exploiting the colonies, and by the transfer, through taxation, ~~as well as by~~ ^{through} business and trade, and also by other colonialist methods, of an enormous amount of wealth from Asia, Africa and Latin America into the industrial heartland of North-western Europe and North America.

The presence of the "red peril" acted as a "moral" justification for all sorts of openly imperialist loot and plunder, and as Stalin observed, Capitalism survived by an intensification of its imperialistic activities. A trade structure was built up which would drain the periphery of its raw materials and cheap labour, and at the same time use the periphery as an expanding market for the centre's products.

Perestroika in China

Compromise with Capitalism?

(Paul Gregonis)

In China the economy seems to be in a boom, but with dozens of problems which seem almost out of control. ^{China's} ~~their~~ perestroika has a softer name - "economic reform". ~~They~~ China ~~do~~ have unemployment, but they do not call it by that name - official estimates speak of 30 million 'people waiting for employment'. After all that is only 3% of the population, a much lower rate, if official estimates are to be believed, than most countries. Inflation ^{seems} ~~is~~ now out of control, ~~thought~~ ^{two digits already} ~~not yet~~ as bad as for ~~example, in India~~. China ~~still~~ ^{has yet to achieve} does not have self-sufficiency in food, and growth of agricultural production is still slow, as in the Soviet Union. Official corruption and bribery are rampant.

^{full swing} ~~there~~. Despite all that the boom is in Chinese Communist Party General Secretary Zhao Zhiyang said in a major speech in September 1988, that China would try to slow down its "overheated economic ^{development} ~~growth~~" to about 10% next year. Investment in fixed assets is also to be cut down by 50 billion Yuan (Rs. 20,000 crore), i.e. by 20% of the total this year. Both wages and prices ^{individuals and} have been going up, and now that enterprises are free to buy in the market, consumption has shot up. Zhao said they have to bring down inflation below 10% in the coming years. In 1989 it will still be above that.

An English version of

The full text of Zhao Zhiyang's 10,000 character ~~address~~ report to the Third Plenary Session of the 13th CPC Central Committee has been published in the Beijing Review (Vol 31, No 46, Nov 14-20, 1988).

He described the economic reforms which began almost ten years ago as having "put an end to the closed, stagnant situation China was in before the reforms began and ushered in a new ~~era~~ ^{period} of historical development".

But he also acknowledged that "although China's economic situation ~~is~~ at present is, in general, good, there are still many difficulties and problems, the most serious of which is inflation caused by excessive price hikes".
"The fundamental reason", says Zhao Ziyang "for this situation is overheated economic development and the ~~out~~ outstripping of total social supply by total demand".

The main problem, strange enough for a socialist economy and also for the Chinese who for 30 years or more got used to taking orders from the top, ^{perceptive} ~~is~~ is a lack of macro-economic control and supervision, in other words a failure in centralized planning supposed to be characteristic of socialism.

The Chinese are acutely aware that they are in a period of transition from the rigidly centralized pre-1979 system to an evolving three-tier system of "mixed economy". The first tier consists of state-owned and state-managed enterprises in certain key industries. The second tier is formed by formerly state-managed smaller enterprises now handed over to workers' collectives, and managed now by a co-operative, autonomous, collective board of six or ten such enterprises, with full freedom to ^{buy, sell, take loans,} share profit, re-invest, start new enterprises or close down unprofitable existing ones. The third tier is the surprising bold innovation, not yet part of the ~~Russian~~ ^{Soviet} perestroika, of an ^{almost} totally free sector of ~~privately~~ individually owned private enterprises, both industrial and agricultural.

The second and the third tiers constitute the bulk of Chinese perestroika or economic reform. They also account for the present economic boom, which China is desperately seeking to bring under some form of central control. ~~Such~~ The infra-structure for such macro-economic central control is only slowly evolving in China.

Over-all planning⁻⁴⁻, including banking and finance, strict control of money supply, efficient management of savings deposits, ~~the~~ supervision of revenue accounting, both private and public, a reasonable and efficient structure of taxation to prevent ~~just~~ unjust ^{appropriation, undue} accumulation and uneven distribution of surplus value or profit, control of balance between over-all supply and demand - these are aspects ~~in which~~ of that infra-structure which are only in the first stages of development in China.

Take food production for example. The family contract system, in which ^{farmers'} families are free to market their own surplus product with only the obligation to supply the state with a fixed quota, worked well in the beginning. It boosted total production to an all-time high of 407.3 million tonnes in 1984. But since then agricultural production has stagnated, failing to fulfil targets. The main reason is that the individual farmer is disinclined to invest capital for the development of the farm. Only 3.3% of total ^{national} capital investment now goes to agriculture, compared to an average of 11.9% during 1950-1979 when agriculture was on a collective basis and centrally planned and administered. In the private ownership system, insufficient attention is paid to pest control. Rodents affected 6.7 million hectares of agricultural

Crops in 1981. By 1986 the figure rose to 34 million hectares.

Along with the general economic boom and the ~~three-fold~~ ^{three-fold} increase in family incomes since 1979, there is also a "booze-boom". In 1988 China will produce 5 million tons of potable alcoholic spirits - an average of 10 kilograms per head per year for the 500 million adults over 18. 12.5 million tonnes of grain (1 kg of liquor requires 2.5 kg of grain, on the average) will be consumed thus by alcohol production. Government is unable to control this. In 1987 government asked brewers to reduce alcohol production to 3 million tonnes, but 4.31 million tonnes were produced, and the trend is still upward.

Small privately owned industrial enterprises are also gone out of control, as far as individual incomes are concerned. Time magazine recently published some typically Capitalist "rags to riches" stories from China; individuals have suddenly become millionaires. Government is aware of this. Zhao Ziang quotes Deng Xiaoping as saying: "If over the past few years we had not relaxed control, would it have been possible for China's economy to develop as it has? In the past we enforced control when there was poverty. Now the situation is

different. It is macro-control in the transition to a better-off society". To an outsider that macro-control in China seems inadequate able to ensure socialist justice.

China has, it is clear, after Mao's death and the dethronement of the Gang of Four, taken resolutely to the 'Capitalist road' marked out by Liu ^{Shao-qui} Shao-qui, the main opponent of Mao and the Cultural Revolution. In fact Liu ^(died, 1969) Shao-qui has experienced a post-mortem ^{reinstatement}. His 90th birthday anniversary was celebrated in China on November 24th, 1988 when I was in Beijing. ^{Chinese} President Yang Shangkun and other high officials posed with Wang Guangmei, the widow of Liu, in front of Liu's bronze statue; ^{the photographs were in full newspaper} the Beijing Daily devoted several articles to Liu's Tianjin speeches of 1949, ~~is favoring~~ ~~allowing~~ the Chinese national bourgeoisie being permitted to continue their capitalist-economic activity.

It is from China's second tier of economic activity that the Soviet Union has taken a few pointers for their perestroika. China's achievements in the second tier are quite impressive.

In 1987 the output of the second and third ~~tiers~~ tiers, i.e. urban and rural individually owned or cooperatively managed industries was 200 billion yuan (80000 crore rupees), fully 14.4% of total industrial output.

Meanwhile the first or state-managed public sector had doubled its output between 1981 and 1987. Percentage-wise, however, the first tier output fell from 80.8% in 1981 to 59.7% in 1987.

80.7% (in terms of numbers, not size) of China's enterprises had chosen to be in the autonomous system (what the Soviets call Khossraschest) by June 1988. They have greater operational freedom, without state interference in administration or supply of water and markets. 90% of large and medium sized ^{state} enterprises and 53.3% of smaller state enterprises went over to collective ownership by worker's cooperatives, from 1984-1988.

In ~~that~~ steel production, for example, the state or first ~~tier~~ tier's share fell from 81.6% (1976-1) to 28.4% in 1988. This has reduced energy,

consumption per tonne of steel output ~~fell~~ by 30%. From 1978-1987 industrial output doubled to 1,381.3 billion Yuan (552,520 crores of rupees). This is an average annual growth rate of 11.8%, actual growth every year varying from 21.4% to 4.3%. In 1988 it is expected to be 16%.

China has now become the world's largest producer of cotton cloth, cement and raw coal, fourth largest in steel and generated electricity and fifth in crude oil. Its first 600,000 kw thermal generator is now in operation, and a 500 kilovolt power grid has been functioning for four years. 83% of its total exports are industrial products, worth U.S. \$ 45.5 billion.

1,113,000 scientists and technicians (5.1%) of a force of 22.05 million workers ~~are~~ are employed in industrial production.

Foreign ^{Capital and} technology have been liberally imported in a determined modernisation drive. Indians may be shocked to hear that 73 fully foreign-owned corporations are operating in China in the first half of 1988. The corporations are mostly from U.S.A, Japan and ^{Western} Europe.

The question is interesting - to what extent has China compromised with capitalism in order to increase its economic productivity. In several areas socialism has been definitely compromised - principally (a) in introducing the profit motive as incentive to production; (b) in permitting in part the private ownership of the means of production; (c) in allotting a larger share to market mechanisms in economic production-distribution and (d) in allowing uneven development between the various regions.

If China is still a socialist nation, how do they ideologically justify these compromises? Xu Jiatao, the Hong Kong ^{Director of the Xinhua N.} ~~Zhuo Ziang's~~ ^{September} ~~1988~~ ¹⁹⁸⁸ ~~Report~~ ^{has provided in the same issue of Beijing Review (Nov 14-20, 1988)} is a masterpiece of such justification. ^{Madame Xu} ~~Zhuo~~ does this first by quoting ~~and Engels, and Mao (but not Lenin)~~ ^{she} ~~Marx, Mao, and Lin Biao~~ ^{he} reaffirms China's adherence to the "four cardinal principles" as "the foundation of our country", i.e. ~~the~~ adherence: (a) to the socialist road, (b) to the people's democratic dictatorship (a reformulation of the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat), (c) to the leadership of the Communist Party, and (d) to Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong thought.

she cites: From the 1848 Communist Manifesto (Marx-Eng)

"The bourgeoisie, during its rule of
scarce one hundred years, has created
more massive and more colossal
productive forces than have all the
preceding generations together".

Madame Xu

~~Zhao~~ acknowledges the fundamental principle
of Marxist analysis - namely the decisive
nature of the interaction between growth
in the ~~forces~~ ^{means} of production and the
Corresponding relations of production as
the main motor of social progress.

And this is the point at which capitalism makes
the greatest contribution, ^{according to her,} - in developing the
strongest force of production, i.e. ~~human~~
modern technology based on modern science.

It is capitalism that made the forces of
production grow "from ^{the era of} ~~simple~~ iron tools ~~to~~ and
machines to the epoch of electricity and
the age of computers." ~~The development~~ Micro-electronics,
bio-engineering, space technology, superconductivity,
new forms of energy and new materials,
laser technology, and other factors will continue
to augment the forces of production and to
accelerate changes in the relations of production
and thus in political economy.

It is Capitalism that overthrew the feudal system, and Capitalism will still do so for ^{Societies} ~~Countries~~ still in the throes of feudalism.

Modern Capitalism has also developed new comprehensive and well-organized legal political systems, instilled a sense of competition and efficiency in the people, corrected its own extremes like the monopoly system, introduced planning and state intervention, as well as social welfare systems and income distribution policies based on taxation, improved the living standards of workers, made contributions to education, health, transport and so on. Modern Capitalism, says Madame Xu, is not text-book Capitalism; but one that has matured enough to handle crises and correct ^{many} major faults. It is a necessary pre-condition for socialist development, and according to Madame Xu, China's stagnation was due to the effort to move directly from feudalism to socialism through an idealistic opposition ^{aversion} to Capitalism. But "without the cultural heritage of Capitalism, there would ~~not~~ be not socialism" (sic). China is still in the primary stage of socialism and cannot move to developed socialism without going through a measure of Capitalist development - i.e. "achieving full industrialisation, developing the Commodity economy, and establishing a political structure that corresponds to the needs of the new economic order." In

all these fields, capitalism has already acquired much experience."

Madame Xu, sitting in Hong Kong in the midst of a concentrated capitalist experience, can use language which definitely departs from the usual Marxist way of looking at capitalism, but she seems to express the view of the ruling elite in Beijing; else Beijing Review would hardly publish it. That elite has developed more ~~elite~~ sophisticated slogans like: "the state regulates the market, and the market guides the enterprises" which many marxists would find difficult to accept.

For India it is important to observe that China devoted the first thirty years of her independent life (1949-79) to create a socialist base for life, something India never even tried. It is on this socialist base, ~~the~~ achieved at great cost ~~to~~ and with a discipline beyond India's reach, that China now introduced a capitalist sector, and a market mechanism which has to guide even state-owned and co-operatively owned enterprises. The process is by no means smooth. The 50-billion Yuan cut this year in investment has left many jobless. Farmers who left their farms to work in urban centres are now going back to the villages in their thousands. 13

million (90%) of urban construction workers came from rural areas and ~~are~~ many have lost their job with the freeze in the urban development.

Inequalities within ^{Chinese} society have grown dramatically. There is a great gap between developed Eastern Coastal regions and under-developed western areas. Most of South-west China, especially an area of some 800,000 square kilometers along the upper reaches of the Yangtze river, with a population of some 130 million, is now regarded as least developed. 20 million people there lack adequate food and clothing and constitute one-third of China's 60 million poor. The reckless felling of trees has led to serious deterioration of the environment. Out of China's 65 million minority people, some 10.5 million live in this region and need most help.

"Common prosperity does not mean simultaneous prosperity", say some of the defenders of unequal development like Huan Xiang. Some areas will develop first, and others will be induced to emulate. There is a party-sponsored campaign against egalitarianism. The idea promoted is that total equality of salaries is not possible.

even in socialism; because people are different in physical and mental aptitudes, in level of cultural and technological development, and in capacity for organisation and management as well as in attitude to work. And they invoke the socialist principle in justification "from each according to one's capacity, to each according to one's work".

x x x

I have had the privilege of spending a few days as a guest of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and its director Zhou Fusan, an old-time friend. I have had extensive discussions, often through interpreters with several Chinese social scientists as well as ordinary people. My judgments are not based on deep study or extensive knowledge of Chinese development. But on this occasion of the India-China summit, I venture the following comment based on general impressions.

1. There is definitely ~~an~~ ^{the} introduction of Capitalism into a socialist economy in China. Those who raise questions about Soviet perestroika being a compromise with Capitalism should study the Chinese economy where such compromise is openly acknowledged and unashamedly promoted.
2. The face of China has visibly changed. People in the developed cities are happy, well-dressed, and no longer as taciturn as they used to be. The dull drab blue-grey Mao-suits ~~are~~ have nearly disappeared. Women wear colourful and well-tailored clothes. The fashion industry has boomed, with a large export sector. People make more money and spend more money.
3. The old ~~Kuan~~ xenophobia is nearly gone. There are no negative predispositions against Indians or the Soviet people. The old "dismissiveness" as our ambassador in Beijing Sri C.V. Ranganathan put it, towards India is no longer there. I felt a new warmth in the response of people towards me as an Indian.
4. China is fast seeking to improve her relations with all her Asian neighbours, including India and the Soviet Union.

5. China has been mending fences with all the "four little dragons" of Asia who grew fast with the aid of western capital and technology. South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong. The new developments in relation with Taiwan are particularly striking. In the past year more than 260,000 Taiwanese have been allowed to visit their relatives on the mainland. Economic, cultural and academic exchanges in both directions are fast developing.
6. China seems to be accelerating its military development, especially in the nuclear and naval sectors. As one of the world's five nuclear powers, she has declared herself to be a "no first strike" nuclear power, but she is also fast developing her nuclear strike power. China's disarmament policy is quite at variance with that of India or the Soviet Union.
7. As regards India and our border issue with China, I personally agree with the Chinese position that it is not possible to make the settlement of the border dispute a necessary pre-condition for improving mutual

relations. I believe that improvement in mutual relations has first to make considerable progress and an atmosphere of mutual trust and mutual respect has first to be generated before a friendly, reasonable and just settlement of the border issue can be negotiated.

8. I also believe passionately that the defusing of tensions in Asia is a necessary precondition to the Asian peoples who constitute half the world's population can play their legitimate role in deciding on the destiny of humanity. An Asian detente can lead to greater socialist unity and help develop a necessary counter-weight to the concentration of international decision-making power in the Trans-Atlantic region.

The Communist Manifesto
(Karl Marx and Frederic Engels)

Paul Verghes
Int: Relation

" A Specter is haunting Europe - the Specter of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German police spies".

The Communist Manifesto begins with the significant statement that Communism has already taken root on the soil of Europe, and that the established powers of the Continent are already (in 1848) straining every nerve to devise ways and means of exorcising it.

Its first Thesis is that since Communism is by now acknowledged to be a power to be reckoned with, the Communists of all Europe should now get together and make their views public. The occasion of the Manifesto, was in fact such a conference in London, ~~accompanied~~ when it was published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages.

I
Bourgeois and Proletarians.

Thesis.

The history of all existing society is the history of class struggles.

In every epoch of history, there is a

! Gradation of society into ranks or classes. In the middle ages, for example, there were the feudal lords, vassals, Guild masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs etc. with further gradations within each class.

Our epoch is the epoch of the bourgeois, the class of modern capitalists or owners of social production and employers of wage-labor, a class that sprang from the ruins of feudal society, and grew fat by industrialisation and colonisation. In this epoch the class struggle has been greatly simplified. There are only two great classes directly facing each other, Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. Industry is the tool of the middle class to come to power. Its coming to power marked the end of all the old class distinctions and established a new principle of life — naked self-interest. It has sacrificed all the other freedoms of life in favor of one single freedom — Free Trade. In place of the old exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted a naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. ~~They have~~ ^{It has} brought down all the old haloed professions to the level of ordinary wage-earning servants — including physician lawyer and priest. Even the family has been made into a money relation.

"The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere".....

"The bourgeoisie....draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst. i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image."

They urbanize the country. It agglomerates population and centralizes the means of production, thus centralising property ownership and political power too in the process. Independent and loosely connected states and provinces become integrated to form single units.

But modern bourgeois society which has

Created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all the preceding generations together, now finds itself no longer able to control the powers it has conjured up. Overproduction is one of these terrific factors that come upon society periodically like a famine or an epidemic. The conditions of the bourgeois society become too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them.

How does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces, and on the other by the conquest of new markets and by the more thorough exploitation of the old markets.

In proportion as capital develops, the modern working class, also develops. These laborers are a commodity who must sell themselves piecemeal, and are hence exposed to all the vicissitudes of a competitive market. The cost of production of a commodity determines its price in the long run, and similarly the cost of a laborer is dependent on the barest minimum for his subsistence and propagation.

The proletariat keeps growing as labor becomes less and less skilled, owing to the advent of machinery. Women join the labor force. The lower strata of the bourgeoisie themselves, unable to bear the competition of wealthier capitalists sink gradually into the proletariat.

The Proletariat also goes through various stages of development. First the struggle is directed against machinery itself which has deprived the laborer of the dignity of his profession. But they are an incoherent mass scattered all over the country, and if there is any union in any area, it is sponsored by the capitalist for his own ends.

But as it grows, it feels its own strength more. Machinery abolishes all distinctions between laborers by more or less flattening out the wage scale. Slowly they begin to form Trade Unions. There are occasional riots. The ~~the~~ struggle is directed more against the bourgeoisie now.

Individual Trade Unions get organized as communication develops and the class struggle becomes no longer an isolated phenomenon. In spite of the threat of competition among the workers themselves, the organizations grow stronger for ever, mightier. They even get legislative enactments in their favor.

The bourgeoisie meanwhile has to face keen competition among themselves, with the aristocracy, and also with the bourgeoisie of other lands. They appeal to the proletariat for help in these ~~two~~ latter cases, the latter becoming stronger in the process of helping the former.

at this point the dissolution in the old society has reached a crisis, and a section of the bourgeoisie that has comprehended the nature of the historical movement, goes over to the proletariat. Of all the groups that struggle against the bourgeoisie, only the proletariat is revolutionary, because all the other groups are merely trying to conserve themselves and are hence reactionary. The "social scum" that does not form part of the proletariat, are for the most part, the bribed tools of reactionary intrigue. The proletariat on the other hand has no interest in conserving any of the values of the bourgeoisie, including their law, morality and religion. Their mission therefore is clearly destructive.

So far in history all previous movements have been movements of minorities. The proletariat movement is the only movement in the interest of the immense majority. When this huge lower stratum of present society raises itself up, it cannot but throw off the whole superstrata.

This raising itself is at first a national phenomenon in each country - but it is inevitable. Bourgeois society has not been able to maintain even the minimum for the slavish existence for its under-dogs. Hence the existence of the bourgeoisie is no longer compatible with the existence of society. "Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable".

Proletarians and Communists.

Question. What is the relationship of the Communists to the Proletariat as a whole?

The Communists are distinguished from other working class parties only in that it is independent of all nationality, and that they represent the interests of the working class movement as a whole. They are, for that reason, that section of the working class which pushes all others in every country; they understand the line of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the movement.

"The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat." (p. 24)

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property — it is in this sense that the theory of the Communists can be summed up in the single phrase, "Abolition of private property". We Communists do not desire to abolish the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labor, but bourgeois private property is not ~~the~~ acquired as the fruit of a man's own labor.

Capital - wage labor antagonism Capital is a collective product, set in motion by the united action of many members of a society. It is therefore not a personal, but a social power. So when this power which belongs to many members of society is ~~changed~~ converted into the property of all members, it does not lose its character of personal property. It merely loses its class character.

Wage-labor on the other hand, gets merely just enough to continue his existence - a minimum wage. In bourgeois society the surplus of the laborer's produce is used merely to command more labor and thereby make more capital and command more labor and so on. It is this vicious circle that we want to do away with - not the surplus labor as such but its use to serve the ends of the ruling class. In Communist society this surplus will be used to widen, enrich and promote the existence of the laborer.

Bourgeois objections - This means the abolition of individuality - yes bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence and bourgeois freedom. The freedom of buying and selling has any meaning only in comparison with the restricted selling and buying of the middle ages. In communism we abolish buying and selling as such. All the other freedoms that you are talking about are freedoms of the bourgeoisie - freedoms that are denied to 9/10 of humanity! We plan to destroy the individual - the bourgeois individual who stands in the way of the masses of humanity.

You say, abolition of private property will lead to universal laziness. If that were true, bourgeois society ought to have gone to the dogs long ago; for those who work get nothing, and those who get anything do nothing.

Your culture, your family, your education, your law, everything is merely the projection of the will of your class and we expect all of it to vanish with the vanishing of capital. Your clap-trap about the family and education is so much non-sense for under the present system they are being torn asunder anyway.

You accuse us with trying to establish the community of women. Well, what do you have in your bourgeois society. Your wives to you are merely tools of production. You use your the wives of your proletarians and prostitutes; besides you seduce each other's wives! We are merely exposing your hypocrisy - and establishing an openly legalized community of women in place of your concealed one.

You accuse us of abolishing country & nationality. Yes we plead guilty. When exploiting man by man disappears, exploitation of nation by nation must also disappear.

Your religious and philosophical charges against Communism do not even merit an answer. Christianity won its victory over ancient religions because they were rotten. Rationalist ideas won the victory over Christianity in the 18th century for the same reason. Each successful idea was the tool of the victorious class. Communism being radical, departs from all traditional ideas.

So all your bourgeois objections to Communism are without any basis.

So the first step in the working class revolution, is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class; to win the battle of democracy. Then the proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie; to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state and then to increase the total of productive forces

It might be necessary in the beginning to use some despotic methods for this purpose ~~in the beginning~~. These methods will be different in different countries. In the most advanced countries, "the following will be pretty generally applicable."

- ✓ 1. Abolition of property in land and use of all land rents for public purposes.
- ✓ 2. Heavy graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance
4. Confiscation of property of all emigrants and rebels
- ✓ 5. Centralized national state banking.
- ✓ 6. Centralized state-owned communication
- ✓ 7. Extension of state-owned production machinery
8. Equal liability of all to labor - industrial armies.
9. Gradual abolition of distinction between town and country by more equal population distribution and integration of agriculture with manufacturing industries.
- ✓ 10. Free education for all children

When class distinctions finally disappear, political power, which is the organized power of one class to oppress another will also disappear.

III

Socialist and Communist Literature.

1. Reactionary Socialism.

a) Feudal Socialism.

Socialism has its origin in the feudal aristocracy that succumbed to the bourgeois, and used the working class as a tool to lampoon the new boss and to whisper in his ears sinister prophecies of impending doom. Its real motive was vengeance and venation at its own loss of status. "The Aristocracy, in order to rally the people around to them, waved the proletarian alarm-bell in front for a banner." "Christian Socialism is but the Holy Water with which the priest consecrates the heart, burnings of the aristocrat".

b) Petty Bourgeois Socialism. This is a socialism brought up by the lower strata of the Bourgeoisie who find themselves constantly hurled into the proletariat and have to continuously struggle to keep themselves in the middle class. Sismondi was the head of this school. It is correct in its evaluation of the contemporary economic system but its political aims are reactionary and utopian.

c) German Socialism. - a form of literary socialism which philosophized on the French revolutionary ideas - a pedantic emasculation of Socialism and Communism, masquerading under the name of "True" Socialism.

2 Conservative or Bourgeois Socialism

A part of the Bourgeoisie is desirous of redressing social grievances; in order to secure the continued existence of

bourgeois society. To this class belong the hole and corner reformers of every imaginable kind. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat.

Bourgeois Socialism attains adequate expression when, and only when, it becomes a mere figure of speech. Free Trade - for the benefit of the working class. Protective Duties - for the benefit of the working class. Prison Reform - for the benefit of the working class. - in other words bourgeois - for the benefit of the working class.

3. Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism.

Critical-Utopian Socialism of the Owenite-Fourier type does not recognize the class-struggle or other inevitable historical forces, but tries to make society conform to a certain pattern invented by them. They appeal to society as a whole & not to any one class in particular. They reject all revolutionary action. They wish to attain their ends by peaceful means. They propose the abolition of class antagonisms without recognizing their existence - again reducing their philosophy to systematic pedantry.

IV

Position of the Communists in relation to the various existing Opposition Parties

The Communists ally themselves temporarily with any opposition party whose present program is in

accord with Communist objectives. In other words, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

"Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

"workers of all lands, unite"

crises in capitalism and ⁱⁿ socialism as well

(Paulo Gregorio
Metropolitan of Delhi)

"Crisis of capitalism" has by now become a disgustingly well-worn cliché. Ever since Karl Marx popularised the phrase in the middle of the last century, capitalism has ^{in fact} outlived many crises and emerged out of each one stronger than before. So much so that many Capitalists, not only in the west, but also in my country, ^{India,} do sincerely believe ^{keep} that it is Socialism that is now in crisis, and ^{hope} that ~~it~~ ^{socialism} will not outlive the present crisis. I shall certainly say a word also about the crisis in socialism but let me first seek to present my imperfect understanding of both the perennial and the current crises in capitalism, mainly in order that I may benefit from your comments.

Capitalism has, as a system, an inherent perennial crisis, ^{built into it.} It has ^{certainly} also faced a number of different kinds of other crises, as it has developed through successive stages, and come to the final stage of imperialism, which has marked it for the past 200 years or more. Within that final stage of imperialism, it entered a new stage with the end of the second world war - in the second half of this century; whether or not it ^{has} ~~has~~ now ~~in the~~ ^{emerged from} ~~process of entering~~ yet another ^{crisis} ~~new stage~~ within neo-colonialist imperialism, ^{i.e. the crisis of the seventies,} we should examine in this lecture.

The rate of inflation cuts into the real earnings of the worker, despite all trade union activity and government populism. The capitalist system cannot survive unless it makes each labourer produce the surplus value necessary not only for capital investment but also for a high rate of profit on huge investments. There is no way for Capitalism to get out of this perennial crisis situation. It dooms the system itself in the long run; but so long as there is no viable alternative, the system will perpetuate itself by all sorts of means.

But Marx ^{or Engels} should not be misunderstood as having (See page)

2. The First Historical Crisis of Capitalism - The Rise of the Socialist State.

It is interesting to observe how the Capitalist system develops a high degree of robustness by facing and overcoming crises. The way it has faced and outlived two major historical Crises reveals its ^{temporary} inner strength as well as its ultimate weakness.

The first major crisis in history that the Capitalist system had to face was the appearance in history of a concrete viable alternative - the emergence of Russia as a socialist power controlled not by the owners of private property but by the working class. Of course it was not an advanced Capitalist country like Britain or Germany that first became Socialist. This shows that there is no strictly pre-determined sequence by which Capitalist societies become socialist. But the presence of Russia as a socialist power, precisely at the time when the Capitalist nations of the west were in the throes of the First world war, soon to emerge victorious.

But Marx or Engels should not be misunderstood as having taught that under-consumption by the poorer sectors of society explains the ^{perennial} Capitalist Crisis. That Crisis has to do very specifically ^{with} the Capitalist mode of production, and not just ^{with} the existence of the poor which has been there also in pre-Capitalist societies. *

Marx's argument is that surplus value is the source of profit for the Capitalist. Increased wages reduces surplus value. So if the Capitalist, in order to increase the purchasing power of the worker, ^{so as to sell all he produces,} raises his wages, ^{would but actually} cuts into his own profit margin. This is the contradiction.

The State can often intervene as a consumer to increase the level of demand, but that does not resolve the contradiction that to raise wages is to reduce profit - of course assuming that other things remain constant.

On this see John Weeks, "The Sphere of Production and the Analysis of Crisis in Capitalism" in Science and Society Vol XL1. No. 3. Fall, 1977

pp 281 ff. ~~And~~ K. Marx, Capital Vol II, pp 414-415

also F. Engels Anti-Dühring, London, 1962, pp 393-394
feature of

1. The Perennial Crisis of Capitalism

According to Karl Marx, the system of market economy Capitalism, or if to use the more glorified term, that of free enterprise and private ownership of the means of production, adumbrates within itself an inherent contradiction which belongs to its very nature.

Marx has clearly shown, at least in a theoretical frame, how the Capitalist producer's primary aim is to keep the wages of the worker to the minimum possible, and to maximise his profit by simultaneously increasing the efficiency of the forces of production (say machinery, technology etc) and keeping the wage level as low as possible. This means that the Capitalist system ~~does not~~ encourages ~~full~~ unemployment in order that the labour market can be ^{kept} competitive and ^{so that} the labourer is ^{always} under pressure to sell his labour to the producer for less than its worth ~~production value~~. This seems fairly obvious. Marx also argued that by keeping the labourer's wages low, the producer is reducing the purchasing capacity of the worker and thereby harming his own market. This latter argument has been weakened by two developments - the growth of trade unions and their partial success in fighting for higher wages, and the pressure under which the State which largely serves the interest of the Capitalist is forced by the exigencies of the "democratic system" to stand for a more egalitarian society. Despite much

The reconstruction of the Capitalist Countries, however, was assisted in the three decades after the First world war by the possibility of plunder and more systematically exploiting the colonies, and by the transfer, through taxation, ~~as well as by~~ ^{through} business and trade, and also by other colonialist methods, of an enormous amount of wealth from Asia, Africa and Latin America into the industrial heartland of North-western Europe and North America.

The presence of the "red peril" acted as a "moral" justification for all sorts of openly imperialist loot and plunder, and as Stalin observed, Capitalism survived by an intensification of its imperialistic activities. A trade structure was built up which would drain the periphery of its raw materials and cheap labour, and at the same time use the periphery as an expanding market for the Centre's products.

FASCISM—THE PERENNIAL TEMPTATION PAULOS MAR GREGORIOS

In 1918, at the end of the First World War, Thomas Mann, the great German humanist, wrote a political treatise : *Reflections of an Unpolitical Man*. It was a defence of German nationalism. Of course, he later whole-heartedly repudiated what he wrote. In 1930, three years before Hitler came to power, Thomas Mann made a spirited appeal to the cultured bourgeoisie and to the working classes to oppose German nationalism with all their might.

But in 1918, this 43 year old, cultured, literary writer (who won the Noble Prize for Literature in 1929), could be so emotionally moved by the defeat of Germany in the first World War, that he could support German Nationalism, which later became the forerunner of National Socialism. It is a warning to all of us here in India too. When things go bad for a nation, there is an increased temptation to an anti-humanist totalitarianism.

But Fascism did not begin in Germany. It was an Italian movement and *Fascism* was a peculiar Italian creation. The word was first used by Benito Mussolini in 1919. The word had two connotations—one associated with ancient Roman imperial glory and the second with the united strength of the people bound together by absolute authority.

The *Fasces* was the insignia of authority in the ancient Roman Empire. It was a bundle of birch rods tied together with an axe. Every Roman official carried it as a badge of authority. In the city of Rome itself, the axe had to be omitted, because authority was supposedly in the hands of the "free citizens" without the arbitrary

ruler symbolized by the axe.

The Italian word *Fascio* meant a bundle, a close-knit group under clear authority, with a high sense of identity with the national soil and the uniting ties of blood, excluding and hating foreigners.

Mussolini started out as a leftist, by 1912 editor of Milan's *Avanti* : (Advance :), advocate of the poor, militant anti-militarist.

Mussolini's ideology was an odd mixture—a little Marx, a little Sorel, a little Nietzsche, and a lot of himself. The ideology is related to Hegel's (1770-1831) conception of the national state as a materialisation of the Absolute Idea; and to Johann Gottlieb Fichte's (1762-1814) quasi-deification of the national collectivity. These German thinkers regarded the state not as instrumental, but as an end in itself. The person or individual received his dignity, objectively and ethically, only in the state.

It is also related to the French anti-Parliamentarians Maurice Barrès (1862-1923) and Charles Maurras (1868-1952). These men despised the democratic French state and admired the more autocratic Roman Catholic Church. They agreed with Oswald Spengler (1880-1936) in his belief (also that of Friedrich Nietzsche—1844-1900—who was strongly anti-nationalist) that the decadence of the west was to be attributed to democracy and Christianity. They were all anti-liberals.

Mussolini learned from all these, but also from the anti-liberal French Socialist Georges Sorel (1847-1922) in his contention that the bourgeoisie was effete and decadent while the proletariat alone had vitality. Mussolini was a socialist, who founded the socialist party *Il Popolo d' Italia* (The People of Italy).

He came to power in 1922 by popular support, and showed his true colours in 1932, with his article on *Dottrina del Fascismo* in the *Encyclopedia Italiana*.

"Our programme is simple. We wish to govern Italy. They ask us for programmes, but there are already too many. It is not programmes that are lacking for the salvation of Italy, but men and will-power.

"War alone brings up to their highest tension all human energies and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to face it. Fascism carries this anti-pacifist struggle into

the lives of individuals. It is education for combat . . . war is to the man what maternity is to the woman. I do not believe in perpetual peace; not only do I find it depressing, but it is also a negation of all the fundamental virtues of man”.

The consequences for Mussolini were the thirst for empire, the rape of Ethiopia in 1935, the formation of the Rome-Berlin Axis with Hitler in 1936, entering the Fascist side in the Spanish Civil War in 1938, and joining World War II on the side of Germany in 1940—leading to defeat and dismissal in 1945.

Adolf Hitler was much more racist than Mussolini, and much more anti-communist. Nazism, the German version of Fascism, was a reaction to the proletarian victory of Bolshevism in 1917, and to the defeat of Germany in 1918. The German people, Hitler felt, could not advance, because their advanced technology and industry were inhibited by a semi-feudal national political structure. Unlike in Italy it was clearly a bourgeois, anti-proletarian movement. Nazism built upon Hegel's conception of the Prussian state as the highest manifestation of the Absolute Idea, by adding the racist doctrines that the Nordic Aryans, the *Herrenvolk*, were the only creative race on earth destined to rule over the others, (*Deutschland ueber Alles*) and that the salvation of Germany from defeat was necessary for the salvation of all humanity. Two enemies were identified as “western capitalism and slavic Marxism”, which were both Jewish. So Jews and Slavs were to be exterminated.

The ideology and techniques used by Adolf Hitler are frighteningly reminiscent of the current U.S. administration and particularly president Reagan. Hitler had great faith in the power of the spoken word. Even a total lie, if repeated with conviction and often enough, will be accepted as truth, Hitler believed. He also held that propaganda should be formulated at the lowest possible intellectual level. It was important to appeal to the vanity of the German people and constantly to tell them that they were the Number one people, and that their interests were sovereign over the interests of all others. Narrow Patriotic sentiments should always be stirred up.

Fascist movements sprang up in other countries also. In Spain the Falange Espanola, under the leadership of young and fiery

Jose Antonio Primo de Riviera (1903-36) was an anti-bourgeois movement. But when the young leader died at 33, Franco used his Falange as an instrument of the conservative aristocracy. In Belgium the Flemish reactionaries organized the Verbond van Dietsche Nationalsolidaristen. In Norway, the Quisling group organized the Nasjonal Samling, with the St. Olaf Cross as its emblem. In Romania the Legion of the Archangel Michael under bodreanu used an orthodox icon as its emblem.

In Japan, the army took charge on Feb. 26, 1936, and systematically assassinated west-inclined liberals. The Emperor Hirohito and his will were the highest principle of morality.

In Argentina, Juan and Eva Peron with the support of the poor, used the anti-yankee imperialism plank to create a fascist organization and seized power in 1943.

In South Africa, the white Afrikaners developed a racist fascism which is the only one still in power. It is also the oldest Fascist Party in terms of birth—the Christian-National Party having been formed in January 1940. By 1940, it was clear to the white regime that Nazi Germany was its friend and Communist Russia its foe. A series of fascist minded leaders of varying degrees, General Herzog, General Smuts, Verwoerd, Vorster, and now finally Pieter Botha, have tried to uphold the structures of an unjust racist totalitarianism.

German National Socialism was the pivot of world fascism. Hitler, much more than Mussolini, was its true prophet—racist, militarist, imperialist, anti-pacifist, anti-socialist, totalitarian, anti-intellectual, and ultimately inhuman.

In the thirties when Nazism was establishing itself, it was not perceived as a threat by the world capitalist system. In fact, the western nations first perceived Hitler as an ally in their anti-communism. Only when their own interests were threatened did they turn against Hitler. Till the last part of the war, the Allies secretly hoped that Hitler would destroy the Soviet Union. They thought they could turn against Hitler after he had done the job for them of destroying the first country to establish a workers' regime.

It was the Soviet Union's historic role to destroy this reactionary movement. It was in that process of combatting the mighty war

machine of Hitler that the Soviet Union finally found its inner strength and deeper coherence. It would be interesting to speculate what the world would have been like if the Soviet Union had not been there to combat the Nazi terror and the reactionary forces of conservative but technically proficient capitalism behind it. Would the allies have been able to break Fascism without the Soviet Union taking the brunt of the Nazi attack and sacrificing 20 million of her citizens in that combat?

Perhaps the question is idle. Those who know the nature of the Nazi terror and its diabolical inhumanity to which five million Jewish people were offered as a holocaust, would know also that humanity is ever in the debt of the Soviet Union for beating back the forces of darkness and diabolism—forces which are rearing their heads again in Western Europe, Japan and the Americas. Even in Germany, it is socialism alone that will ultimately be able to cope with the latent Nazism.

Leftist

~~(Vishwanath)~~
The Hippie and the New Leftist
(SATYAPRIYA)

~~Student Unrest~~ ~~and bears so much like~~
~~the day of "Student Unrest."~~ ~~Unrest~~ ~~seems such an~~
~~un-practical word. There is more to it than~~
~~mere restlessness. And if all the truth, it is~~
~~not just students who show unrest. The~~
~~phenomenon extends to young people outside the~~
~~university, as well as to many not so young ones.~~

The restlessness is directed
against the "system", the establishment, the
Status Quo. The main charge is hypocrisy
or lack of authenticity, at least in western
affluent societies. The major malaise may
be sheer meaninglessness - the painful
awareness that life has no point at all.

The drop-outs, the stay-ins, the
hawks, the doves, the coeds, the upstarts, in
the hippies, the New Left, the protesters,
the marchers - these are the phenomena of
societies where poverty has been all but
banished, where distribution of wealth is
more equitable than ever before, where the
aged, the infirm and the unemployed are

1/ fairly well cared for.

What do they want? Someone asks. Their answer is "Do you want to give us what we want on a platter, so that you can be rid of us and continue comfortably in your snug, bourgeois, hypocrisy?" No, modern youth is not making demands which the older generation can easily meet.

In fact, they are our judges. They are our prosecutors. They point the accusing finger at us and say: "What you have done is not so good. The world is in bad shape. You have made the world what it is. And you are guilty."

Then we are even more puzzled. We ask our young people, "What kind of a world do you want us to make? Tell us, and we will try."

The young people reply: "No, thank you. We don't think you could understand it if we told you. Just hand over the power to us, and we will try our hand at creating a new world according to our own ideas."

"But you are too young. Running the world is serious business. It takes experience and maturity. You will wreck the world in no time" - so my generation replies.

"To hell with your experience and

/ maturity. What you have done with it is enough evidence against its usefulness. Just let go, just get out, and ~~let us try~~ ^{allow us} to make our own mistakes, ^{on} our own way."

With that, conversation breaks down between the generations. What we then have is the "generation gap". A widening gap which makes us apprehensive. What is our youth coming to, we ask in consternation.

x x x

In affluent societies contemporary youth is called "post-modern", since they have had "modern" parents. The "modern" style of their parents' way of life seems to them archaic. Affluence cannot be adequate as a goal for living.

In America, Sweden, Germany, U.K. and other western countries, youth protest takes two somewhat different but related forms. For want of better terms we shall call one of them "the hippie" ^{type} ~~form~~ and the other the "New Left" ~~form~~ ^{type}.

Both protest against the status quo. The ~~hippie~~ New Left's angry young men and women want to change society radically, using violent revolution if necessary. But they at least regard human society as redeemable. Human existence can become

meaningful only through change of structures.
both in the nation and between nations.

change the politics, economies and culture
of mankind, in order to save man - that
seems to be the cry of the New Left.

The hippie is different. He
regards current society as irredeemable. So
he opts out or drops out. For him
salvation can come only from the expansion
of personal consciousness - through L.S.D. or
other drugs, through "transcendental meditation"
a la Maharshi Ramesh Yogi, or through
"flower culture" and similar patterns of
passivity.

This is of course not to say that
all students and youth who protest or are
restless belong to these two categories. No,
rather, there are the two distinct types
that can be clearly delineated as articulated
forms - one with a secularized social
gospel, and the other with an equally
secularized ^{gospel of} personal salvation.

But this secularized gospel,
whether it is a "social gospel" or a
"gospel of personal salvation", has very little
relation to the secular gospels peddled
by contemporary secular theologians. They

~~do not want to~~ youth refuses to accept the urban-technological society as the ideal form ^{for today} of the Kingdom of God. Neither Harvey Cox nor Leslie Dewant, neither Bishop Robinson ^{of Detroit to God fame} nor the Death of God theologians enter much into with either the New Leftist or the Hippies.

Who then are the Prophets of Protest for youth today? For the Hippie type, there are no real prophets. They tried the Maharshi, and despite an early romance, Communications would at present appear to have broken down.

The New Left, on the other hand, has its articulate and outstanding prophets, martyrs and heroes. A list of names would appear shocking to many of our bourgeoisie.

The three that top the list are Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh and Che Guevara. These three are heroes in the fight against Big Power Establishment, especially America's dominating power over the world's economy, culture and politics. Less known in political circles, but more astute as creators of ideas, are the Major Prophets — Herbert Marcuse, the 70-year old Marxist Philosopher who teaches at the University of California in San Diego (in hiding at

the moment of writing in response to threats on his life) and Frantz Fanon, the Jamaican philosopher of revolution. America is the Cuba of the

Strangely enough, the New Left, with its philosophy of revolution, finds itself making the greatest progress. At the University of Michigan, for example, the Students for a Democratic Society, recently organized a "Radical Education Project" which sought to acquaint students with the new thinking of Marx, Fanon, Guevara, Mao and others of a similar persuasion.

The writings of these men are selling like hot cakes in the U.S.A. and are spreading also in Western Europe. An anthology of some of this new thinking is to be published this year in a book entitled "Beyond Dissent" edited by Steve Weissman.

this bear to the University^U and the concerns of higher education? What does this protesting generation, this riotous generation want?

1) The Crusade against hypocrisy. According to a recent analysis by a Yale Professor, the generation now in power had their childhood before the second world War. Their parents were basically Victorians. They themselves, however, had been exposed to some new ideas of equality and freedom. But they grew up in this duality - forced to practice the Victorian morality of their parents (at least in public) while intellectually accepting contemporary ideas like racial equality, the equality of the sexes, the freedom of the young, sexual liberality and so on.

Their children, who were born after the war, do not know much about this Victorian morality. They have openly accepted the newer and "freer" morality. Their parents claim to understand them, but when they really practice what their parents intellectually accept, the parents are displeased. This they regard as hypocrisy. They indict the older generation of lacking in integrity. They want a clean break with the past, because it is dishonest and crooked. They want an honest open society.

2) Impatience with the impersonality of present structures of society.

They have no patience with all the sham and show in the religious and socio-cultural institutions of the established order. Youth is all for honest, open, intimate, warm, personal relations. The structures stand in the way by imposing form and propriety, rules and regulations, inaccessible and alienated, institutional authority structures, and the pretentious vanities of social custom.

(to my Victorian generation)
A shocking label button which demands to "make love, not war" ^{has} that kind of interpretation. Be warm, be intimate, not brutal, aggressive, cold, correct, forbidding. That is what youth wants.

3) Impatience with all Confining boundaries

Youth does not like denominationalism, nationalism, racialism or any other form of exclusionism. For them all young people belong to their set, irrespective of his or her religious persuasion, racial stock, country of citizenship. Especially in Western countries, young people ignore their own co-nationals in order to befriend Africans, Asians or Latin Americans.

in the rough and tumble of life. Hence the antipathy towards examinations and all the paraphernalia of formal higher education which seem to them so unrelated to life. They are not anti-intellectual, but they search for the keenest analysis of the Vietnam situation or other human realities, while neglecting medieval history or philosophy or such ^{alienated} academics. They want more information - but relevant information.

Modern Youth is getting very disgusted with ^{much of} the content of education, which in their impatient eyes, seems to have no action value for the present.

6) Disgust with Affluence and the technocratic paradise.

Strangely enough there is a great disillusionment among contemporary youth about the much vaunted benefits of the affluent society. Not that they admire poverty; but they feel that the kind of affluence now available in western societies regiments life, destroys the joy of life and is based

the protesting generation takes on the
external of poverty as its banner —
the tattered dress, the crumpled fatigues,
the unkempt hair, the unshaven face,
and sometimes even unwashed bodies. Not
that they are poor — but they want to
deflate the claim of ~~behave~~ the western
economies to have discovered paradise
in the form of the urban-technological
civilization.

1) Enthusiasm for Freedom

Freedom and joy are the
key words of protesting youth. Sexual
freedom, which has been much publicized,
is not the most important aspect of this
freedom. One is surprised at the sexual
self-restraint practiced by many young
people in private, while outwardly they
flaunt all the ^{preferred} moral conventions of our
generation.

Overcoming inner inhibitions,
breaking down outer walls, taking off
all false supports, ^{overcoming authority} this is the negative side
of the campaign for freedom. On the
positive side they ask for freedom

the ability to enjoy life, the capacity to let go and let swing, ease and spontaneity of movement and relationships, and anything in short that seems to create freedom and joy.

X X X

There are all, of course, positive evaluations of youth's protesting quest. It is possible to give another interpretation which ~~gives the~~ paints the riotous generation as irresponsible, disorderly, undisciplined, disloyal and all the rest. That would be merely to prove the point of youth's charge that we of the older generation are uncomprehending and insensitive.

HUMAN RIGHTS

A PERSPECTIVE FROM OUTSIDE WESTERN CIVILISATION

(Paulos Mar Gregorios)
India

I am sincerely grateful for this opportunity to bring to you a perspective on Human Rights from outside Western civilisation. No one can pretend to represent the non-western world as a whole, because of its extreme diversity within itself. I can represent only my personal views at this time of history. These views have changed and developed through the years, and are likely to change again in the light of wider experience and further reflection.

Outside western civilisation does not mean, however, outside the Christian tradition. I speak as a humble Christian, though I do not make frequent reference here to my Lord Jesus Christ or to the Christian Scriptures. I shall try not to be theological in my approach, though the faith of the Christian Church does provide me with the basic foundation of that approach. I have learned much from and about western Christianity, but I find it quite difficult to follow some of its approaches. And I will not take an activist approach to the question of human rights, though many in my audience would prefer that to a reflective, theoretical approach. By constitution I am unable to act without some reflection, and you must forgive me if you think I am too abstract or even irrelevant.

Let me apologise, at the very outset, for my poor and inadequate grasp of the noble German language, with which I have struggled since my student days in America. It was mainly a reading knowledge that I sought there to acquire but even in that I have not achieved any great level of proficiency. The present text was first composed in English and then translated into German by my kind hosts here in Bremen. I read it in German in order to save you some time. I hope some of my thoughts come through despite my faulty accent and incorrect pronunciation.

The Concept of Human Rights

Human Rights can be understood only as a concept born in Europe and America in the 18th century. Its ancestry goes much further back in western history, of course. One could mention the Magna Carta, the Petition of Right (1672), the Habeas Corpus Act (1679), and the Bill of Rights (1689) in England, as well as other pieces of national legislation in European countries. In general the concept of human rights was used to affirm the rights of the new bourgeoisie over against the feudal overlords.

The birth of the concept is integrally related to developments in western history and culture in the 18th century, including the French Revolution of 1789 and the American Declaration of Independence in 1776. Thomas Paine, the English polemicist, who went to America for thirteen years from 1774 to 1787, published his Rights of Man in 1791. During his stay in America, where he helped his friend Thomas Jefferson to draft the American Declaration of Independence in July 1776, he served as the Secretary of the Congressional Committee on Foreign Affairs. His pamphlet called Common Sense (1776) had a great influence on Jefferson and on American history. It was a defence of Republicanism as opposed to Monarchy. The later work on The Rights of Man was a scathing response to Edmund Burke's denunciatory Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790).

Paine was as uncritically eulogising the Declaration of the Rights of Man, made by the National Assembly of the New Republic of France in 1789, as Burke was uncritically denouncing the French Revolution. If Burke was an undiscerning advocate of the status quo in Britain, Paine was unduly relying on a document on paper with noble ideas which were soon to be belied by the historical reality of the Jacobin tyranny of the French Committee on Public Safety and even more by the reign of Napoleon Buonaparte. It is one thing to put noble ideas into a declaration; it is more difficult to embody these ideas in a political economy. This is a principle we should always keep in mind when we discuss questions like Human Rights.

The French Declaration on the Rights of Man had 27 articles. According to Paine, the first three were of the essence:

"I. Men are born, and always continue, free and equal in respect of their rights. Civil distinction, therefore, can be founded only on public utility.

II. The end of all political associations is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man; and these rights are Liberty, Property, Security, and Resistance of Oppression.

III. The Nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty; nor can any individual, or any body of men, be entitled to any authority which is not expressly derived from it."

In Paine's view, "the first three articles are the basis of Liberty, as well individual as national; nor can any country be called free whose Government does not take its beginning from the principles they contain, and continue to preserve them pure; and the whole of the Declaration of Rights is of more value to the world, and will do more good,

than all the laws and statutes that have yet been promulgated." (Rights of Man, Everyman's Library edition, 1966, pp. 98-99)

The notion of Human Rights seems thus to be of basically American, French and English origin. The philosophical foundations of the notion were worked out, however, by none of the three nations mentioned. That job fell to German thinkers, particularly to Kant and Hegel. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) sought to establish philosophically the burghers' contention that the individual person is always to be treated as an end in himself/herself and not as a means to an end. A deeper and more comprehensive, but by no means easily comprehensible, account came only with Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's monumental work: Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, which came out in 1821.

The philosophical foundations of the concept of Human Rights in western Liberalism always go back to Kant and Hegel, except when western writers avoid philosophy by resorting to Linguistic Analysis or a naive Pragmatism. The framework of Hegelian philosophy is so complex that very few even in Germany today fully comprehend it. Everything seems to revolve around Hegel's notions of Begriff and Idee. The Idee is Reality. It is the unity of Der Begriff (the concept) and its existence.

	"Der Begriff und seine Existenz sind zwei Seiten,
	geschieden und enig, wie Seele und Leib...Die Einheit
	des Daseins und des Begriffs, des Koerpers und der
	Seele ist die Idee...Die Idee des Rechts ist die
	Freiheit, und um wahrhaft aufgefasst zu werden, muss
	sie in ihrem Begriff und in dessen Dasein zu erkennen
	sein." (Phil. des Rechts, #1 Zusatz).

For Hegel, the basic ground of Human Rights is the Idea of Freedom, the Idea that works itself out in history through a process of temporal development. Kant grounds Human Rights in the individual's infinite worth, an assumption of faith and not a matter to be logically demonstrated. Hegel grounds it in the nature of Reality as a whole and in the Idea of Freedom as a general aspect of Reality. This too cannot be logically demonstrated, but is an assumption of faith, a less individualistic faith than Kant's, but still faith. And for that reason, Hegel can say:

"Dieses Recht, so hoch, so goettlich es ist, wird aber in Unrecht verkehrt, wenn nur dies fuer Denken gilt und das Denken nur dann sich frei weiss, insofern es vom **Allgemein-Anerkannten und Gueltigen abweiche und sich etwas Besonderes zu erfinden gewusst habe**" (Vorrede).

and "Der Boden des Rechts ist ueberhaupt das **Geistige** und seine naehere Stelle und Ausgangspunkt der **Wille**,

welcher frei ist, so dass die Freiheit seine Substanz und Bestimmung ausmacht und das Rechtssystem das Reich der verwirklichten Freiheit, die Welt des Geistes aus ihm selbst hervorgebracht, als eine zweite Natur, ist."

(# 4)

Hegel was right in seeing the close inter-connections among Human Rights, Human Freedom, Human morality regulating the Human Will, and the Law as enacted and enforced by the State System. Thomas Paine was one who regarded the least government as the best government, while for Hegel, the State system was the embodiment of the most advanced stage of human development. Paine, who believed that "the more perfect civilisation is, the less occasion has it for Government" (op. cit. p. 159), was indeed a believer in God as "the great Father of all", but would have denied any foundation for the "Rights of Man" in any religious convictions. Hegel, on the contrary, got his basic notion of Recht from his Christian convictions, and his fundamentally Christian world-view. The question of the philosophical-theological ground for a notion like Human Rights needs to be debated in the global community; such a debate will not only fundamentally enrich our thought but also make us see how, starting from different spiritual foundations, humanity can arrive at a pragmatic consensus.

The United Nations and Human Rights.

In our own time there have been a large number of declarations and formulations about the Fundamental Human Rights, but it was the setting up of the United Nations in 1945 with Human Rights given a prominent place in its Charter and its promulgation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 that serves as a starting point for any discussion on human rights today.

In the Charter of the United Nations, the Preamble (reportedly drafted by Jan Smuts of South Africa) reaffirms the faith of "the peoples of the United Nations" in "fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small". Article I(3) of the Charter states as one of the aims for which the U N is established, as "international co-operation...in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion". Articles 55 and 56 elaborate further these commitments. The UDHR of 1948 spells out further the fundamental rights.

If one asks the question however, as to the basis and foundation for these great and noble affirmations, one gets into difficulties. Is there a rational or philosophical justification for these affirmations? How does western Liberal thought justify Human Rights? How does

Christianity and the other religions of the world ground their concern for Human Rights? Why did Islamic Saudi Arabia abstain from voting for the UDHR in 1948? Is the liberal consensus the only ground on which these affirmations stand? Has there been a referendum of "the peoples of the United Nations" to check whether there is in fact such a consensus? These are questions that need to be discussed.

It should not be forgotten that when the United Nations Organisation was formed in 1945, it was largely a trans-Atlantic organisation in terms of power and membership. The vote on December 10, 1948, in favour of the UDHR was 48 for, 0 against and 8 abstentions. Six Communist countries, South Africa and Saudi Arabia had abstained. The drafting Committee consisted of USA, UK, USSR, France, Austria, Lebanon, China and Chile. The last three were at that time totally pro-western, and the USSR did not vote for the UDHR. In China it was the Chiang Kaishek regime then. The UDHR is thus primarily a western document. Hence its emphasis on individual rights, the social rights being mentioned only in outline. It is true that the UDHR had a great impact on many national constitutions of countries which became independent after 1947. The UDHR has subsequently been supplemented by two other covenants adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession, by the UN General Assembly on December 16th, 1966:

1. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and
2. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, with an Optional Protocol.

These covenants, though ratified so far by only few nations, came into force in 1976; but their implementation, even in the few countries which have ratified them, is making very slow progress.

Some Comments and Questions

In view of the limitation of time, I would like to offer just five brief comments on the UDHR.

1. The Notion of Right. This is a notion that has come into vogue as a result of the revolt against the autocratic or aristocratic authority of the feudal lords. A right can be moral or legal. A legal right can be enforced only through a law-governed State, and is largely meaningless without an authority capable of enforcing it. Moral rights are integral to any civilisation, and quite often people themselves enforce these rights without recourse to court of law or civil authority. In fact we are living in a world where more and more moral demands are met by persuasion than by legal compulsion (e.g. conservation of energy in a world of energy

shortage).

We should also distinguish between a right and the principle on which it is based. The equal dignity of all human beings is a principle from which many human rights are derived. But no set of legal rights can exhaust the principle. The principle can be embodied in the Preamble to a national constitution, but until it becomes something which the people can fully internalize, no amount of law will be able to implement principles like democracy, the dignity of every human person, the unity of humanity and so on. It would therefore be unwise to put all the emphasis on the legislation and implementation of rights; equal emphasis is due to the task of educating the people to uphold the fundamental principles on which the rights are based. Let me just mention briefly five such principles on which there is a growing universal consensus:

a. The integral unity of all humanity, all life and the whole order of reality. (I have tried to avoid theological words like Création, because these principles should be acceptable to all religions and to all secular people).

b. The freedom, worth and dignity of every human person within economic, social and cultural structures which promote and augment these.

c. Constant progress towards accessible and effective justice for all, within and among nations and peoples.

d. National and international structures which can settle disputes without recourse to war, provide comprehensive security for all peoples without weapons of mass destruction, and can promote peaceful global co-operation in many areas like science/technology, education, media, economic activity, the healing arts, culture, sports and social creativity.

e. The special responsibility of the Human Species to care for the biosphere and for an environment which promotes life and health, and to prevent its disruption by careless human stewardship.

It should be clear that in all these five fundamental spheres legislation on human rights can go a long way, but structural change seems more important, if these principles are to be embodied in human life. There are limits to what can be achieved through legislation on fundamental Human Rights.

2. Universality. The four words in the title of UDHP have each its own significance. The main thing about the U N declaration is that it is not confined to any one nation, but speaks of all human beings universally. It is an invitation to move out of parochial-national loyalties, to looking at

the whole of humanity as one entity. In most of the earlier national declarations about human rights, there was a tendency, not always expressed, to think primarily of the rights of middle class white western persons. Only in the anti-slavery and anti-apartheid movements we saw the recognition that non-white people are also humans and have equal rights with others. The more we become aware that all human beings are of equal dignity, the more we can clearly see the sheer irrationality of our narrow national loyalties and of the immorality of making our national interests take precedence over the interests, freedom and dignity of other nations and peoples.

We will have to learn to set our national loyalties within the context of our loyalty to the international and global human community, of which we are members with others. This is not primarily a question of changing laws, but of a new global consciousness emerging in people all over the world. But laws are also important. First the constitution of each nation will have to recognize openly and clearly that it is a responsible and free member of the global community of nations. Second, we will need to agree as a community of nations to develop a new GLOBAL Social Contract and to create the beginnings of a global legislature, judiciary and executive. This is implied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but not made explicit. There is not much point in making a universal declaration of human rights, when there exists no global machinery to enforce those rights.

3. Declaration. The UDHR remains only a declaration, and not yet international law. There are jurists who interpret the UDHR as having the force of universal or inter-national law. If the UDHR and the two covenants are signed, ratified and acceded to by all nations, they would of course have the force of law. To move from Declaration to Inter-national Law is an urgent need in relation to the UDHR and the two covenants. National governments are still most unwilling to give up their assumed sovereignty at this point and to begin to move decisively and resolutely towards international structures in which the nations invest some authority. The urgent need in each country as well as globally is to press national governments to accede to the UDHR and the two covenants, as an important move towards legally binding international law and structures.

4. Human. The word "human" in the UDHR is very significant. Once we realise the full force of this word, we will be reluctant to use words like "aliens" and "foreigners" in relation to people living outside our national frontiers. We will have to see that we share a common humanity and a common global citizenship with such people from outside our frontiers, and that we are all mutually responsible members of a single global human community. This realisation will be a

great step forward.

But we will also have to see the fact that the word "human" cannot be confined to adult citizens alone. Apart from special women's rights, we will also have to formulate laws about Child Rights. We will then have to engage in a global discussion on difficult issues like when a human life begins, when a fertilized human ovum in utero begins to have rights, whether the human embryo is the property of its parents to be disposed of at their will, and so on. The word "human" is a liberating word, but it can also be a confining word. Do only humans have rights?

FN

What about the rest of the living world? Do they have any rights? Do animal species have a right to survive? Do animals and birds have a right to be protected from human cruelty and mistreatment? Are there limits to human killing of animals, for sport or pleasure, for food or scientific experiments? Do trees have rights? Or is their right to exist entirely dependent on human need perceptions? Do mountains and rivers have a right to remain undenuded and unpolluted by humans? These are indeed difficult questions to resolve unanimously; but the debate must soon begin in every country.

5. Rights. As we have already stated, the concept of Rights is of western origin, though that in itself is no disqualification. But in thinking of Rights, we are likely to think primarily of judiciable rights - that is, legislation and law enforcement. We Christians know that Law can be an enemy of the Gospel, though not in every case and not every law. Do we look for salvation of humanity and the world by Law? The letter kills; the Spirit gives life. As Hegel rightly saw, "der Boden des Rechts ist ueberhaupt das Geistige" and "die Freiheit seine Substanz und Bestimmung ausmacht"; can we really aspire to a Rechtssystem which is genuinely a Reich der verwirklichten Freiheit, which functions without law and compulsion out of a redeemed human nature clothed with the good as a habitus, practising the good out of its own grace-filled essence?

We Christians and others know that we should not murder, even if there was no law against murder. It is not because the Law says that human beings have rights that we practise love towards all. Rights belong to Law and the State. The love of God and His Creation belongs in another category. It is that love of God and His creation that should impel us to seek a world where the five principles we mentioned above are in truth practiced. The Kingdom of God does not fully manifest itself in history; but the Kingdom comes every day, and it is as an aspect of that Kingdom that we should pursue the Rights of Man also. Thy Kingdom come, indeed!

Minorit3

August 24, 1994

MINORITIES IN A SECULAR DEMOCRACY
RANDOM REFLECTIONS OF ONE WHO HESITATES

(Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios, Metropolitan of Delhi)

May I be permitted to use this occasion to pay humble tribute to the memory of a noble and kindly soul, heroic and honest, quickwitted and compassionate, who is no longer with us in person. Rajiv Gandhi appeared on our political horizon as a bright light instilling new hope in those who craved for a statesman radically different from the usual type of politicians.

When our nation became politically independent 47 years ago, Rajiv was a three year old lad. And what kindled hope was the fact that while belonging to the post-independence generation, he was politically unsullied, despite his ancestry, when he was thrust into power in 1984 following the heart-rending national tragedy of Mrs. Gandhi's assassination. Alas, the equally infamous Sriperumbudur tragedy took him away from us less than four years ago. May God grant rest to his soul.

I must also pay tribute to his noble widow, Smt Sonia Gandhi, who has also shown her mettle by declining to accept to be President of the Congress Working Committee to which post she was unanimously elected in May 1991.

At this point, on behalf of the minorities, I want to pay tribute also to the memory of Shri Jawharlal Nehru, who, more than anyone else, succeeded in making the national minorities feel secure in independent India. The Minorities of this country are grateful also to the Supreme Court of India for consistently upholding the fundamental rights of the minority communities. We feel grateful to the Congress Party in so far as it seeks to maintain that noble Nehruvian tradition in protecting these minority rights.

We would also like to thank the present Government for setting up in 1992 a National Commission for Minorities as a statutory body with civil adjudicatory power. Perhaps a word of appreciation is due to the Commission and its Chairman Justice Mohammed Sardar Ali Khan, for their efforts to deal effectively at the grass roots level with the communal tensions which arose in the wake of the Ayodhya and post-Ayodhya debacle.

I must, however, express my perplexity at the fact that the Welfare Ministry, in declaring the Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists and Parsis as the five national religious minorities, chose to leave out the Jains who are indeed a national religious minority, the arguments for whose exclusion fail to carry conviction. I hope this anomaly would soon be rectified.

I must also venture to express my pessimism about the incorruptibility, impartiality and efficiency of the newly set up Central Minorities Development and Finance Corporation to which the Prime Minister has pledged 500 crore rupees as share capital. We are indeed grateful for Welfare Minister Sitaram Kesri's pledge

- a) to provide financial assistance for modernisation of Muslim madrasas, and to make special efforts to promote education especially women's education, among the minority communities;
- (b) to eliminate communal bias and ensure objectivity in the contents of educational textbooks;
- (c) to implement the scheme to grant financial aid for pre-Competitive Examination Coaching for Weaker Sections based on Economic Criteria;
- (d) to provide financial assistance for competent studies leading to a reliable data-base on the present socio-economic and educational status of national minorities;
- (e) to promote self-employment ventures for the minorities; and
- (f) to provide financial assistance for children of victims of communal riots.

These are to be welcomed; equally important is the prompt and effective implementation of the 15-point Programme for the Minorities evolved by the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in 1983.

Perhaps it is appropriate for me to express my continuing distress at the Presidential Order of 1950 (1950 Scheduled Caste Order No. 3) which decreed as follows:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in paragraph 2, no person who professes a religion different from Hinduism shall be deemed to be a member of a scheduled caste."

Why should benefits accruing to a scheduled caste person in a secular society be based on his or her professing a particular religion, especially the majority religion? This is indeed discrimination against the minority religions of this country. It no way fits our noble tradition; it should be urgently removed from our statute books by another Presidential Order.

I shall not use this occasion to give utterance to the complaints of the Christian Minority about infringements of their freedom in running educational institutions, including appointment of teachers and admission of students. The matter, I understand, has been most recently referred by the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, to the Chief Justice, with the request to convene a larger bench to consider the questions formulated by the Constitution Bench. As lawyers F S Nariman and Soli Sorabji argued in Court, Articles 29 and 30(1) of our Constitution did not bestow any concessions or privileges on the minorities, but were meant to protect the fundamental rights of minorities to run and administer their own institutions, and Government should not restrict these rights in any way. I will leave that matter there.

I want to raise two rather significant points here, which apply to all religious minorities as well as to the majority community.

I

The first is a rather simple point. No amount of legislation can solve the minorities problem in our country. It calls for radical changes in the basic attitudes, and in the content of religious teaching, of so-called minority and majority communities. The law of course has a didactic function in educating people and making them aware of crimes which they often tend to overlook. The abolishment of untouchability and the opening of the temples to

all Hindus, though done by legislation, have fulfilled an educative function in changing the attitudes of people. But we know that a law, for example, against offering or taking bribes will not by itself remove bribery from our government system. Implementation of such a law by exemplary penalties would go only as far as the implementation itself is effective and cannot be circumvented by further bribes to the implementing officers.

Education is of course the key. But who will educate? Who will educate the educators? The government? Judging by past experience, I have some hesitation. I would propose a three-pronged approach, consisting of committed non-government organisations, the religious leadership of both the majority and minority communities, and certain government agencies not too much bothered about vote-banks, working in tandem with each other. All three groups stand in need of furthering their own education regarding minority rights in a secular democracy. There should be an immediate effort to bring these three groups together, without media presence at least in the beginning, for extended sessions, as a national educational process,

- a) to explore the basic principles which should govern minority and majority community attitudes and conduct towards each other and towards the unity and integrity of the nation; and
- b) to formulate a fundamental code of attitude and conduct in this matter for both majority and minority communities.

I hope the Minorities Commission can take an initiative soon in this regard.

II

The second brief point is to reflect once again on these notions of majority and minority based on religious affiliation. Why should my primary self-identification for myself in India today be in terms of my belonging to a minority religious community? Am I not an Indian as much as anyone else? Why should anyone see me primarily as a member of a minority community? Why should my Hindu friends in turn think of their identity first in terms of their belonging to the majority community rather than in terms of their being Indian first.

I emphatically reject the oft-repeated dictum that religion is a matter of individual choice and is entirely personal, to be kept out of the public realm. Religion, as any sociologist can tell you, is neither individual nor private; it is by nature corporate and public, belonging to the beliefs and practices of a community; one individual does not create his/her own religion, except in the fantasies of some of our semi-litterati; religion is, I repeat, by nature corporate and public. Still we should put religious belonging in its proper place.

My own religious commitment is rather deep and basic for me; but out of it also comes my commitment to the whole of humanity, and to all my fellow-Indians. I believe a lesser commitment would not be worthy of a great religion. It is my religious commitment which will not let me regard the interests of my own religious community as somehow more important than the just interests of other minority and majority religious communities.

Since I am not a Constitutional Fundamentalist, may I here make the affirmation that the constitution of a secular state should not think in terms of religious minorities and majorities in its fundamental legislation.

The Constitution of a secular state should provide for communal harmony and pluralism in religious practice; should guarantee religious freedom for all, subject to the general consideration of morality and the welfare of the whole citizenry; should legislate against privilege and discrimination on the basis of religion; should not support one religion over against the others; should delineate clearly what the Government can and cannot do in the protection and administration of the property and institutions of majority and minority religious communities (e.g. Devaswom boards, Temple Trusts, post-Ayodhya settlements). It should not however make people think of themselves in terms of religious majority and minorities.

In providing for positive discrimination in favour of religious minorities, the Constitution should discontinue reservation of electoral constituencies on the basis of religion, as the Constitution itself demands. It should have so ceased in 1989, 40 years after the Constitution came into force.

The 62nd amendment of 1989 has extended the period till 1999; five years is hardly enough time to start a national discussion on this and come to some sane conclusions; but the issue is such a hot potato that political parties shy away from it. The minorities themselves should reflect on how they can get adequate representation in the political process without the religion-based reservation of seats .

In the case of admission to educational institutions and special scholarships, social/economic criteria rather than religious affiliation should be in the forefront of consideration. Again a great deal of joint reflection by the majority and minority communities needs to be started now on how this provision for positive discrimination on a religious basis can be eliminated and still justice secured for the economically and socially backward communities.

My main concern is that we should as Indians desist from the very bad habit of thinking in terms of religious majority and minorities. In our country the sufferers are the majority, the victims of our unjust system, who come from all religious and non-religious communities, from the religious majority community as well as from the religious minority communities. Disability does not come from belonging to any particular religious community; it comes from a socio-economic system in which the beneficiaries are the minority and the disadvantaged constitute the majority. It is this system that needs to be overhauled, and towards this end the majority community and the religious minorities should work together. This is the challenge before the nation, and in this even the privileged socio-economic minority in the country must work together with the sadly marginalised majority whose interests are remembered only in political speeches. That really is the majority-minority issue in our country.

A, Preliminary ^{Personal} Evaluation from Inside
(Metropolitan Paul Gregoris, Secretary for External Church Relations,
The Orthodox Syrian Church, the East)

We have been living under a national emergency, ever since it was declared on 26th June 1975. The declaration of the emergency has called forth a volley of criticism both within and without India. Not least among these has been the letter written by the General Secretary of The World Council of Churches, Dr. Philip Potter to Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India on October 9th, 1975.

As a citizen of India, and as a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, as well as a delegate of the Orthodox Syrian Church of the East to the World Council's Fifth Assembly in Nairobi, Kenya, I wish to offer the following comments on the situation as it appears to me on 15th November 1975, when this is being written, after a period of more than four months under national emergency.

There are ~~three~~ ^{four} questions to be answered

- ① Was the declaration of national emergency necessary?
- ② Have the Common man's dignity and freedom been adversely affected by it to any substantial extent?
- ③ What has been achieved by it? What have been the abuses of it?
- ④ Is it likely to continue indefinitely?

The answers to these four questions could also in a sense throw light on the following remarks of the ~~United~~ General Secretary, the World Council of Churches addressed to the Prime Minister, India

"We understand that a very large number of political prisoners have been held under Emergency laws. There is widespread distress over the detention without trial of people arrested on political grounds and the total denial to them of any judicial remedies. We feel strongly that the powers now assumed by the Executive, under the amended Maintenance of Internal Security Act, which provides that no grounds be given for the detention of any person and that no person detained shall have any rights to personal liberty by virtue of natural law or common law, constitutes a very serious abridgement of human rights. More than three months have elapsed since the declaration of the Emergency and the continuance of these measures against those who have dissenting political views is very disquieting. We are also concerned about the regulations regarding the dissemination of information in the country. We welcome the attempts you have initiated to carry out, with greater vigour and determination, economic reforms for bringing about justice to the masses. However, the participation of all sections of the people in the task of building the nation, for which you have exhorted the people especially in recent months, requires to disseminate information, exchange of views including dissenting

I Was the ^{declaration of} Emergency justified?

There are some who argue that if there are any positive gains from the Emergency, ~~most of these~~ they could have been achieved ~~too~~ just as well in the normal course of things with a little extra effort.

The Government of India brought out in July 1975 a pamphlet entitled "Why Emergency?" and a summary of it was also published under the title ~~Reason for Emergency~~ "Saving Nation from Lawlessness, Reason for Emergency". The Government's argument may be succinctly summarised as follows:

The trend began with the elections in 1967. There was a leadership struggle within the Congress. Mrs Gandhi won the battle. 1971 ^{elections} ~~polls~~ gave her a massive popular mandate. The opposition had focussed on an attack on the person of Mrs Gandhi. The nation did not give support to the attack. It was an undemocratic minority that led the attack. Vested interests of the extreme right and the extreme left converged in their opposition to Mrs Gandhi, while the masses, the people (not the middle classes, as some people say) were with her.

In Gujarat and Bihar, the extremist parties began organising student strikes. Jai Prakash Narain took the leadership of this movement to oust Mrs Gandhi by undemocratic means. The agitation became
" " " " " " (125 in the h.o. states) died and

there were 544 cases of violence and the police had to open fire 54 times. A large number of policemen were injured.

According to the Government Jai Prakash Narain was inciting the people to armed rebellion. He declared publicly in Sept 1974 that it was an open confrontation with the Centre. In Dec 74, he openly asked the people to revolt, in so many explicit words. He had already engaged in several undemocratic practices ~~and~~ like inciting people to "gheras" or obstruct the Parliament; the government charges that "the opposition parties persistently obstructed Parliament from functioning". Then came the assassination of Shri L.N. Mishra, Minister for Railways, and the attempt on the life of the Chief Justice of India. The Prime Minister's life too was obviously in danger.

The meeting of the opposition leaders from June 21-25 in Delhi was the last straw. Their decision was to launch a nation-wide agitation. They talked about de-recognizing the government; of not paying taxes; Jai Prakash even went to the extent of calling upon the army, the police and government employees to disobey ~~the~~ orders from authorities: ~~the~~ National Emergency had to be declared.

The ^{pro-Emergency} ~~government~~ argument thus seeks to show that if the Emergency had not been declared

- (a) undemocratic forces would have taken over the country by undemocratic means;
- (b) the economy of the nation would have been seriously imperilled to the point of ~~economic~~ total economic collapse
- and (c) there was some danger that some foreign powers were keenly interested in precipitating such a situation so that forces favourable to the Capitalist nations or to the extreme left nations could have taken over power

—

4

14

11

Has there been curtailment of basic human rights?

The allegations have been mainly that two kinds of freedom have been taken away from the people by the national emergency:

(a) The freedom of expression, ~~expressed~~ primarily through free political discussion and dissemination of ideas through organized public meetings and the through the mass media, have been significantly curtailed;

(b) people who are detained by government under the MISA have no recourse to the ~~Courts~~ ^{Courts of law} ~~in order~~ ^{to} ~~get~~ ^{obtain} justice.

Seen from a theoretical liberal perspective, these two allegations, if they are true, amount to a substantial abridgement of fundamental human rights:

But there are many of us, including the present writer, who would like to question fundamentally the theoretical notion of freedom in liberal democratic thought. Are these the basic freedoms, seen from the perspective of where we are in India. Some of us have in our own life-time emerged from Princely States where the will of the Maharajah was law and there was practically no

~~Royal dictatorship~~ such as existed in Travancore, and has given us the basic human dignity that allows us to assemble, express and act with a measure of freedom; and has given us the possibility of appealing to the Courts against the injustices perpetrated against us.

But was this freedom really available to the masses in the country? Did the newspapers truly express the ideas of the masses? Or were many of them controlled by big financial and industrial interests who used their freedom of expression to support and sustain anti-democratic and anti-people reactionary forces? One has to be fair and admit that not all newspapers were equally on the side of the reactionaries. But is it not a fact that practically all the large-circulation newspapers are controlled by the Capitalist Class?

NON-ALIGNMENT — IS IT ANTI-AMERICAN?

(Paul Gregorios)

Non-alignment as a concept is often misunderstood, mainly in two ways: as an attitude of neutrality towards big power conflict, or as equidistance from the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

Neutrality means non-involvement. The non-aligned nations cannot be neutral or non-involved in the power conflicts that affect the human race. Two-thirds of the world's people live in the 130 non-aligned countries. Power conflicts between major powers directly affect their destiny; how can they afford to be neutral or uninvolved? The non-aligned nations are committed only to make their own decisions, on the basis of justice and in the interests of peace and progress for the human race. They give no prior undertaking to be aligned with the policies of one major power bloc or another. Even among the members of the non-aligned group, there is no prior commitment to support the policies of each other in all matters. Each nation retains the freedom to judge any conflict anywhere, whether it be between major powers, between a major power and one of its own members, or between two members of the non-aligned group of nations.

Equally mis-leading is the concept of equidistance. There is no commitment in the non-aligned movement to view the two major powers—the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.—on the same level. The concept that both major powers are imperialist cannot stand examination. The U.S.A. is committed by its present policy to world exploitation and military and economic domination of the world. It makes open and public statements about defending by military force its interests in the Middle East and in Latin America, Asia and Africa. To this policy the non-aligned nations have to be resolutely opposed. The U.S.A. has a record of seeking to suppress the progressive forces in Cuba and Chile, in Iran and Palestine, in Afghanistan and Vietnam, to mention only a few of the better known instances of direct or indirect U.S. intervention. The U.S.A. supports reactionary regimes in Chile, south Africa, Kampuchea and Israel. In the U.N., it has consistently used its power and influence to obstruct all progressive moves.

It is in this context that the accusation against the non-aligned movement to be biased against the U.S.A. has to be examined. There is no prior commitment on the part of the non-aligned nations to be anti-American. On the contrary when the actions of U.S.A. are in support of the forces of freedom, justice and dignity for all, the U.S.A. can expect full support from the non-aligned countries.

On the other hand, the U.S.S.R. and the Socialist Countries have a different record. They have consistently supported all movements for liberation and de-colonialisation in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They have actively assisted the liberation movement in Southern Africa and supported the movement of the Palestinian people for self-determination and a homeland of their own. They have consistently opposed Israel's illegal occupation of Arab-territory and South Africa's illegal regime in Namibia. They have helped Cuba

to resist the mighty power of the U.S.A in the latter's attempts to subvert the Cuban Revolution and to make Cuba subservient to American interests. They have supported Vietnam in its opposition, first to French Colonialism, then to American illegal aggression, and more recently to ~~be~~ the outrageous Chinese attack on a struggling socialist country just beginning its recovery from the ravages of brutal American aggression.

In such a situation, how can anyone expect the non-aligned nations to maintain a position of equidistance from the U.S.A.. and from the U.S.S.R ? Non-alignment is not neutrality. Non-alignment is not equidistance from the major powers. Non-alignment is commitment only to fight anti-human forces wherever they appear- fascism, imperialism, hegemonism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, apartheid, ~~zinn~~ zionism, oppression and exploitation. Non-alignment can be equidistant from two nations only when both nations are equally guilty or equally innocent.

The super-power ideology, propagated by reactionary circles in the western world and China, seeks to subvert the principled commitment of the non-aligned nations. It tells us that we must be equally opposed to U.S.A. and U.S.S.R irrespective of the policies and action of the two nations. Too many two-third world intellectuals are brainwashed by the super-power ideology and insist on treating the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. alike. It is the responsibility of all clear thinking people everywhere to expose the super-power ideology as a new anti-communist play, calculated to confuse and mislead.

Both U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R are powerful. But ~~is~~ it is not against their power that the non-aligned nations contend. What matters is the way power is used. When power is used in support of anti-human forces, the non-aligned will condemn such use of power, and resist it with at least moral force.

When the policies and actions of the U.S.A. become more pro-human and supportive of progressive forces, the non-aligned movement will also become pro-American. It is up to the people of the U.S.A. to see that this happens.

OINAM and Operation Bluebird

Most of us have forgotten Oinam, if at all we heard of it two years ago. Oinam is a small ^{Naga} village in the Senapati district of Manipur, North-East India. The Assam Rifles, a unit of the Indian Army has a camp in the village.

On July 29, 1987, a group of underground Naga terrorists attacked the army camp. These could have been from the NSCN, who are fighting a guerilla war for an independent Nagaland. The Assam Rifles camp was ~~weak and~~ vulnerable, and it seems the officer in charge of the camp was away when the marauders attacked. 9 jawans were killed, and 3 others seriously injured. The raiders also walked off with a 'large quantity of arms and ammunition.

Assam Rifles retaliated with "Operation Bluebird". Unfortunately the Operation, ostensibly to recover the lost arms and ammunition, in fact let loose a reign of terror in the village

Oinam and in the area around. The victims were innocent men, women and children.

In a few weeks Assam Rifles shot down fifteen people. Many of these are reported to have been tortured before being shot. Villagers including women and children were terrorized and tortured by Assam Rifles' "counter-insurgency" operation. Christian churches were used as jails and concentration camps, according to the reports ~~which~~. People were left enclosed inside churches without food or water or medical assistance, and without toilet facilities of any kind at all.

Hundreds of villagers have been reported to have been brutally tortured - hung upside down, buried alive, given electric shocks. Women were raped, homes were looted, houses were demolished, churches destroyed, according to the reports. Villagers were put to forced labour without wages - violating Indian Constitution and law.

No factfinding mission could make it to the village. The Naga Students' Federation sent a goodwill delegation in

September 1987. The ^{members of the} team, including the President of NSF, were arrested and tortured. Even Congress (I) politicians could not make it to the village. The civil administration was paralyzed with fear of the army.

An organisation called the Naga Peoples' Movement for Human Rights (NPMHR) decided to take the matter to the Courts. They were assisted by an able lawyer Ms Nandini Haksar (daughter of P N Haksar, former Private Secretary to Prime Minister). A Writ petition was filed in the High Court at Gauhati on October 5, 1987. The Vacations judge issued notice to the Assam Rifles.

The petition and the appendices (mainly affidavits from victims and eye witnesses) come to a thousand pages. The demand is that the Court lay down guidelines for checking mis-use of power by the military forces, and to pay Compensation to the villagers who have lost people, homes and property.

organisations - like the civil Liberties and Human Rights Organisation (CLAHRO), and ^{by} the Manipur Baptist Convention Women's Union (MBCWU)

The High Court ordered the release of all leaders and villagers arrested, and the payment of compensation of Rs 5000/- each to victims of torture, and Rs 20,000 each to two families of people tortured to death.

In the memorable judgment of July 1988 the court has rightly stated that "the rule of law does not cease to function even under difficult circumstances. The clash of arms cannot ~~drown~~ ^{drown} the voice of law".

In the MBCWU petition, the court directed the judicial Registrar to visit the villages to make enquiries about allegations of rape. Assam Rifles tried every trick to prevent the Registrar from getting to the village. But he did get through and made his report to court.

The court then ~~acted~~ ordered the Sessions Judge to record evidence in the ^{case} charges of torture, rape, ~~and~~ murder, sexual assault, illegal detention, demolition of property, forced labour, looting and so on. Several witnesses have already given evidence.

Lawyers of Assam Rifles take several days to cross-examine each witness, and it takes several months to examine a score of witnesses.

By the time the final judgment comes, three years would have passed after the event.

I have a singular honour today, mostly undeserved, of being the recipient of the Otto Nuschke award. I want on this occasion to pay my tribute to Otto Nuschke (1883-1957), whose last speech in the CDU Parteitag in Weimar resounded with these words of exhortation:

"Christian democrats, (let us give) our whole strength for mutual understanding, disarmament and co-existence, and the promotion of Peace and Happiness for all peoples".

(Gerhard Fischer, Otto Nuschke Ein Lebensbild,

Union Verlag, Berlin, 1983, p. 272)


In the same speech Otto Nuschke expressed the view (in 1956) that just as the second world war ended with ^{the} emancipation of all the slavie people of Eastern Europe, the day would soon dawn when the non-white peoples of the Two-third world would find themselves free from political economies of exploitation and oppression.

I salute the memory of Otto Nuschke - heroic resister against totalitarianism, far-sighted friend of the human race, faithful son of the Evangelical Church in Deutschland, Champion of the struggle of the oppressed and exploited classes, ~~effective~~ effective publicist for the cause of socialism, seasoned politician and one of the founders of the Christian Democratic Union of ^lDeutschland.

May I be permitted to share on this occasion, in honouring the memory of this stalwart servant of socialism and ardent fighter for justice, peace and dignity for all, a few of my own thoughts on the future of humanity and the current debate about the tension between Global Humanism and the Class Struggle.

One engages in such futurological speculation with much hesitation. So much that economic prophets predicted has failed to come true. Capitalism has not yet collapsed. The final triumph of socialism is still in the future. New and unexpected factors arise and change the course of history presumed to have been predictable. The forces of reaction seem to gain new strength from unexpected quarters. The market economy world has shown a resilience which few thought it possessed. It has survived many crises through devious and sometimes anti-human devices. Manipulation of the money market, juggling fiscal and exchange relations, creating artificial markets for armaments by fomenting local wars and false fears of foreign attack; securing billion-dollar orders with hare-brained schemes like strategic Defense Initiative, making nations insecure through strategies of 'limited nuclear war' heightening tension and promoting the arms race, de-stabilizing nations to advance the arms trade - so many devices have been found to keep a sick world market economy artificially propped up.

The major instrument for the defense of the capitalist system has been the uncanny alliance among Transnational Corporations, military establishments, and the institutions and personnel of scientific-technological research, in order to control and exploit the political economic process in many countries. The tentacles of this world-wide system reach into all countries - socialist countries not excluded. Techniques of a very advanced nature have now been developed to wage war on non-cooperating countries through de-stabilization and exploitation of internal conflicts within such nations. But also sophisticated techniques have been developed to co-opt socialist systems into the world market economy system.

 The enemy that socialism has to contend with looks gigantic, sinister and more sophisticated than many first thought.

While socialists cannot be intimidated by the seemingly giant strength and wily cunning strategies of the enemy, neither can they afford to under-estimate the forces against which they have to contend.

There is no doubt, however, that even this great struggle against the forces of reaction should take second place when put side by side with the other great peril - a possible nuclear holocaust which can finish off all classes, exploiters as well as exploited. Not everyone, even in the developed countries, is aware how close this peril of a nuclear war has

been several times in the recent past. Only those who are privy to what is going on behind the scenes realize how ^{proximat} ~~close~~ to us the peril of omnicide has always been and still is.

The recent signing of the INF treaty, (a historic and most significant step in the hesitant and unsteady progress towards a world without nuclear weapons,) should not lull us into some sort of euphoria. The world crisis is still very much there. The market economy system has not opted for perpetual peaceful co-existence with socialism. We will be fooling ourselves if we deduce from the four recent summit meetings between the USA and USSR that the western establishment has given up the policy of confrontation and opted for detente and disarmement. It is not possible even today for the socialist nations to let down their defenses or ^{to} relax in their vigilance.

At the same time it is not possible for the socialist nations to concentrate all their efforts on the defense of socialist values and institutions. To do so has already proved to be inviting another kind of danger - a repressive political system, a stagnant economy, brooding discontent and the collapse of creativity among the people. Socialism can thrive only on a democratic foundation, and the requirements of military defense are always counter-democratic, whether in the market economy or in the socialist system.

I am aware of the fact that the GDR economy is by no means stagnant, that even among the socialist countries the economic achievement of the G.D.R. is without parallel. But that does

not mean the absence of major problems in a situation of encirclement by ^afully armed market economy system determined to overthrow socialism.

It is indeed a dilemma. A socialist party loses all significance if it does not keep the class struggle at the top of its agenda. There is no way to succeed in building socialism without going through the necessary struggles to overthrow the powers of oppression and exploitation - both in one's own nation as well as internationally. And yet precisely in pursuing that struggle one dare not provoke the enemy to the point of effectually committing racial suicide. It is all right occasionally to taunt the enemy with being just a paper tiger; but the fact still remains that there is no limit to what desperate madness even in a paper tiger can do.

On the other hand, there is a way out of this dilemma, ~~a dilemma~~, a difficult way, nevertheless ^ea way that needs to be tried. It is indeed a strategy, but not a dishonest one. This requires the following basic affirmations:

- (a) In the present crisis of human history there is no viable alternative to peaceful co-existence between various political economic systems, especially if they possess nuclear weapons capable of destroying all of us.
- (b) The only possible choice is between armed co-existence on the basis of mutual deterrence by nuclear weapons on the one hand and on the other an uneasy, competitive but friendly and co-operative co-existence in a setting

of detente and disarmament.

- (c) To choose the option of armed co-existence is to make it exceedingly difficult for socialist societies to be genuinely democratic, for the working people to be genuinely creative, and for a high standard of living to be assured for all in a socialist country.
- (d) On the other hand, the option of armed co-existence based on mutual deterrence, at least in the short term, works to the advantage of market economy capitalism; for that system's survival depends on constantly expanding markets; and these seem to be assured by an accelerating arms race and by the world-wide growth of militarism fostered by a deterrence-based co-existence. Capitalism may not succeed permanently in promoting the arms race and thereby perpetually expanding its market. It may collapse from its own debt (or credit) burden and of creativity induced by over-investment of resources and personnel in non-productive military consumption. But the system has shown, so far, rather marvellous and resilient ingenuity in facing its crises and in overcoming them temporarily. By persisting in a deterrence-based co-existence, the socialist countries would be giving backhanded encouragement to the market economy system.
- (e) If on the other hand a situation of true detente and disarmament can be achieved and socialist economies can not only drastically cut down their defense expenditures but also scale down their posture of total vigilance, socialism stands a better chance of reaching the standar

of living necessary for a dignified human existence, and even of outstripping the market economies in both quality and price of consumer goods offered to the world market.

In other words the second alternative, namely peaceful co-existence of socialist economies with market economy countries, in an ambiance of detente and disarmament, is the better strategy for socialism's waging war against systems of oppression and exploitation.

There is little chance that the market economy system can survive much longer in its present form if the continuing arms race and the accelerating growth of militarism in the world were not there. Competing in a true atmosphere of unrepressive freedom and unarmed co-existence based on mutual trust, with renewed creativity in economic and cultural activity and true democratic freedoms, socialism can beat capitalism in sportsmanlike combat - so long as the game is played according to rules and properly umpired. The rules of common security have yet to be developed. There can be no reliable umpire other than a representative body of all humanity.

There is some chance that there can be a comparatively peaceful transition to socialism world-wide. I say 'comparatively' because privileged classes^s do not give up their prerogatives without a struggle. And yet we have seen in India 526 Rajahs and Maharajas giving up without much of a struggle. Of course some people from the privileged classes, as well as lots of people from the working classes, will seek

privilege and undue advantage within a socialist system, as history has already taught us. That calls for a different kind of vigilance on the part of socialism.

The collapse of capitalism may be accompanied by some last-ditch struggles characterized by madness and despair. It is therefore important, for the sake of common security, to eliminate nuclear weapons from our planet and to ban them effectively so that this last ditch madness does not become nuclear madness. We must make the world safe by eliminating nuclear weapons altogether from earth and sea, sky and space. In a nuclear world we will always be insecure, because madness is always a possibility.

It is in this context that we note the outstanding efforts of the Peace Movement in the GDR to eliminate nuclear weapons and to create Nuclear Weapons Free Zones wherever possible. I want at this point to salute the government, the peace movements and the people of the GDR for the high quality leadership they have given and are still giving in the world-wide movement for peace with justice, for elimination of all nuclear weapons, and for common security without weapons of mass destruction.

It is in this context ^{also} that we take a look at only one of the many points raised in the current debate about Perestroika Glasnost and New Thinking.

Two questions have been raised and need to be answered: Does the Global humanism of the New Thinking associated with

the concepts of perestroika-glasnost really displace the centrality of the notion of class struggle which has guided marxist thought in the past? If it actually does so, can such a global humanist ^{approach} be justified in marxist terms?

My own tentative answer to both questions is a qualified yes.

There has always been a dialectical tension between the concepts and strategies of class-struggle on the one hand and the need for peaceful co-existence of opposing ideologies and political economic systems on the other. To abandon this tension would be to adopt a naively Trotskyite notion of permanent revolution. Permanent revolution is a respectable Marxist concept, but has not always been a practical option, especially when the oppressor is armed with weapons of mass destruction. The fact that the party of the working class is also so armed does not reduce the risk of a permanent revolution. ^A ~~or~~ military confrontation ~~that~~ could lead to a nuclear holocaust which would destroy all classes, annihilate the achievements of centuries of human knowledge and culture, and imperil the very existence of any but the most stunted forms of life on our planet. There can be no moral justification for a class struggle where nuclear-military confrontation between the classes could lead to ^{bio-}omnicide and ~~bi-~~icide at worst, and at best to a destruction of a large part of humanity and its achievements, and to a permanent poisoning of the total biosphere.

Faced with that kind of a choice, a genuine class struggle which aims at the emancipation of the oppressed and exploited classes, has to choose a strategy in which the elimination of nuclear weapons from the planet, the protection of space from becoming a launching pad for directed energy weapons, and the painstaking creation of a system of common security for all take a higher priority than military confrontation.

The working classes cannot abandon the class struggle or actually displace it from its centrality in assessment of reality and in formulation of strategy. What is set aside for the time being is not the class struggle as such, but a particular form of class confrontation that could lead to heavy and unacceptable damage to the oppressed and exploited classes.

Global humanism is thus not an alternative to the class struggle, but only its original framework and necessary basis. The class struggle as a concept was from the beginning based on the primary principle of socialist humanism, and was never more than a means to the emancipation of all classes from oppressive and exploitive structures, and to the establishment of a classless global human society with peace, security, justice, dignity and freedom of creativity for all. The victory of the working class can only be a means to go on to a global society of freedom, dignity and justice.

Divorced from that original socialist humanism, the concept of class struggle can become a dangerous dogma and a mis-leading strategy. There is, I sadly note, arising all over the world in leftist political circles, a dogmatic and non-contextual emphasis on class struggle and class confrontation which does not take adequately seriously the peril of a nuclear holocaust. These circles, strangely enough have a record of fervent campaigning in the past for nuclear disarmament as a high priority for the revolutionary struggle. But they now seem to feel that the peril of a nuclear catastrophe is neither imminent nor so alarming. They seem to feel that the nuclear powers of the market economy world would not attempt even a "limited nuclear war", since these powers have correctly assessed its enormous consequences to themselves. In other words, to put it bluntly, these leftist circles have enough confidence in security by mutual deterrence to make them under-estimate the real danger of such a "limited nuclear war" breaking out by design or by accident. They seem to ignore the fact that such a "limited nuclear war" has been and still forms part of western military strategy. They also fail to take into account the fact that the Pentagon which was in the beginning largely opposed to President Reagan's original strategy of "star wars" as a defence initiative, later approved it as part of an offensive strategy including a decapitating first strike and the ^{giving} of a limited nuclear war to fight off the weakened but still considerable retaliatory attack which is to be expected.

CRITICISM OF THE NEW THINKING

Among the leftist parties which have raised questions about General Secretary Gorbachov's statements on perestroika and glasnost one counts the American Communist Party and the Communist Party of India, (Marxist). Gus Hall, General Secretary of the American Communist Party, for example, warns us of the danger in accepting wrong ideas in the name of "new thinking". In an article entitled "The World We Preserve Must Be Livable"², he says:

"Throughout the history of the working class movement, the 'something new' concepts have always been used to bypass, cover up or eliminate the concept of the class struggle. To eliminate the idea of the class struggle one has to accept that somehow the capitalist class is changing its inherent nature, giving up its drive for maximum profits. To eliminate the idea of the class struggle one has to explain how the basic laws of capitalist development have somehow changed. This is impossible."

Gus Hall poses the question : "Should all struggles for a better life, including the class struggle and the national liberation struggles, be subordinated to the struggle to preserve humanity?" He answers his own question with a "no".

2. The Marxist, New Delhi, Vol. VI (2), April-June 1988

pp. 58 ff

3. ibid. p. 59

His argument is that most of the oppressed and exploited peoples of the world are not interested in the idea of preserving humanity, if that is divorced from the struggle to make life more worth living. He takes Gorbachov to task (without specifically mentioning his name) for a 1987 statement by Yevgeni Ambartsumov in the World Marxist Review:

"I do not rule out a negative reaction particularly among those who continue to take a fetishistic view of the class struggle, although Lenin, as we all know, put the interests of social development as a whole above the class interests of the proletariat. The entire world has today found itself in a situation in which precisely human interests must be given priority. In this lies the essence of our new way of thinking" ⁴

Academician Ambartsumov's statement can be mis-understood as anti-class-struggle. But in fact he speaks only of a priority for global human interests, and not of abandoning the class struggle in the interests of human survival.

Looking at the same issue from a Two-third World perspective, the C.P.I.(M) documents question the 'New Thinking' of the C.P.S.U. In a critique of General Secy Gorbachev's Report on the 70th Anniversary of the October Revolution, the CPI (M) Central Committee (May 3-6, 1988) adopted a resolution which said among other things:

4. World Marxist Review No. 10 (1987) p.152. This was response to an earlier article by Dmitri Likhachev entitled "Become a Citizen of the World" (W.M.R.No.5,

- (a) Gorbachov is fundamentally wrong in assuming that the world is becoming more and more inter-dependent and integral. It is "unscientific" to isolate the internationalisation of economic life from the fact of class struggle which is integral to global economic life.⁵
- (b) Gorbachov is wrong again in assuming that Capitalism is willing or able to adapt itself to the conditions "of a nuclear weapons free world, and to a new and equitable economic order."⁶
- (c) Gorbachov is wrong in arguing from the fact that there has been no third world war, that Capitalism is becoming peaceful. It has waged or taken part already (since the second world war) in a hundred or more local wars.⁷
- (d) Gorbachov is wrong in arguing that "at the present level of technology and organisation of production, reconversion and demilitarisation of the (capitalist) economy are feasible". Capitalism and militarism are integral to each other, and the capitalist military machine can be converted to peaceful use only when the capitalist class is no longer in power.
- (e) Gorbachev under-estimates the strength and significance of Third World liberation struggles in the total movement of emancipation of the working class.

5. The Marxist Vol. VI (2). April-June 1988, p. 14

6. ibid. p. 18

7. ibid. pp. 20ff

8. ibid pp. 26ff

The Indian Marxist Party at a later Central Committee meeting (August 8-10, 1988) came to a more positive assessment of the New Thinking. They have reaffirmed the following principles, on which they generally agree with the CPSU.

- (a) The people cannot be replaced by the Party. There is no alternative to direct involvement of the people in governing society, and ⁱⁿ managing the economy.⁹
- (b) The Party has a guiding and leading role in society as a vanguard of the working class.
- (c) The growth of bureaucracy is indeed "a serious impediment, and, if unchecked, becomes a danger" ¹⁰
- (d) The New Thinking in the Soviet Union should be understood also in the light of the practical problems encountered by the Soviet economy.

The August 1988 resolution of the CPI (M) cautions the New Thinking on the following points:

- (a) Too ^{severe} ~~severe~~ and one-sided criticism of the past can be counter-productive. The assessment of Stalin suffers from overlooking the ~~the~~ positive achievements of the period.
- (b) The emphasis on individual human rights should never be at the expense of a basic socialist vision and perspective.

9. "On Recent Developments in the Soviet Union" The Marxist

VI (2) p. 34ff

10 ibid p. 36.

- (c) The working class and the Party of the working class have a special role in advancing socialism, and this should not be ignored in adopting any global humanist or national democratic perspective.

This is indeed a sober and more balanced statement than the May 88 statement of the Central Committee of C.P.I.(

TOWARDS A CONCLUSION

For a non-Communist like the present speaker, it seems obvious that the New Thinking in the Soviet Union did raise some questions in the minds of many socialist parties whether the central marxist notion of Class Struggle was being superseded by a notion of Global Humanism. These fears seem to be not well grounded.

No one can question the fact that the nuclear-environmental peril threatens the survival of humanity, and that the end of humanity would also mean the end of all class. Survival is important above all, say some, since there can be no class struggle without it. Others like Gus Hall say: Survival by itself is not a worthy goal if what survives is an unjust and exploitative society.

Progressive people in the Two-Third World have always held that Peace without Justice is not worth striving for. What all of us need to distinguish at this time is between Peace and Disarmament ^{on the one hand,} ~~as such~~, and avoiding a nuclear catastrophe. If confrontation would lead to catastrophe, then

confrontation may not be in the long term interests of the Class Struggle. If de-emphasizing the class struggle would help to promote detente and avoid confrontation then why not, some say.

In any case the de-emphasizing of the class struggle can only be a temporary matter of strategy and tactics; the socialist parties cannot afford to set aside the primacy and centrality of the class struggle. But if it is known to the Market Economy people that such a de-emphasis is only a temporary and tactical matter how seriously will they take it?

The effectiveness of the New Thinking, I believe, should not be assessed on the basis of a false dichotomy between global humanism and class struggle. It should prove its worth by creating a climate of detente leading to concrete plans for total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, and to global co-operation for saving the biosphere from catastrophe. If it succeeds in these two matters, as well as in the improvement of the standards of quality and effectiveness in socialist production, then the cause of socialism would be truly advanced.

THE PERESTROIKA DEBATE IN INDIA
SOME COMMENTS FROM A FRIEND OF THE LEFT

(Paul Gregorios)

The debate in India about Perestroika and Glasnost in the Soviet Union bears witness to the vitality of the Indian left. Not being a Marxist himself, the present writer as a friend of the Left (committed to socialism in practice) can only hope to enunciate some of the issues in the debate and not to resolve them with anything like finality.

The central issues in the debate seem to be the following:

- 1) Has the CPSU put such an undue weight on the globalist - humanist perspective as to marginalize the class struggle?
- 2) Do the economic reforms in the Soviet Union, such as the law on enterprises, the law on co-operatives and so on mark the beginning of what could be in effect a capitulation to the market economy system and profit motive characteristic of Capitalism?
- 3) Is the CPSU, in espousing Perestroika and Glasnost in the interests of facing the economic, military and cultural crisis in the Soviet Union, laying aside its leading role in the World Communist movement, particularly in relation revolutionary movements and forces in the Two-third world?
- 4) Would Soviet military power fail to support and defend the socialist system, particularly in Eastern European countries, and simply stand by when bourgeois reactionary

movements seek to take over power in countries like Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary?

- 5) Is the present CPSU assessment of Stalin and his role in Soviet as well as international communism too one-sidedly negative?
- 6) How honest is the CPSU in asserting that the fundamental principles on which Perestroika-Grasnost are still those of Marxism-Leninism?

The following comments are meant only to clarify the debate.

1. Global Humanism and The Class Struggle

M.A. Latif thinks that the marginalising of the class struggle began already with the first post-Stalin CPSU Congress in 1956. "The Moscow propaganda concentrated (as early as 1956) on fanning fear of America's 'nuclear teeth' and the danger of kindling any spark anywhere lest it engulf the world in nuclear conflagration" (Mainstream August 27, 1988, p. 25).

Advocates of perestroika would argue that the nuclear teet ~~are~~ real, and not just those of a paper tiger as Mao once claimed. True, to us Indians, it is still easy to argue that the U.S.A knows well the cost to itself of any nuclear war, whether limited or total; that therefore USA will not use nuclear weapons except for deterrence; that therefore the peri of a nuclear holocaust is grossly exaggerated. But as A.K. Damodaran rightly asserts (Mainstream ibid. p.7), "the recent shooting down of the wrong target over the Gulf by the most sophisticated weapon system in the world shows how wafer-thin

is the margin of safety". In a world wired for auto-destruction with hair-trigger readiness, no nation can sit back under delusions of security.

The cumulative evidence leaves us in no doubt that the world market economy system will not baulk at using nuclear weapons if it can make sure that the damage to itself can be held down to an "acceptable level". That situation has not substantially changed even after the four super-power summits and the signing of the INF treaty.

The nuclear threat cannot be isolated from the over-all strategy of the market economy system in confronting the socialist system. Nuclear weapons, even when unused, serve more than just the purpose of deterrence. Even more important are the two other reasons - to maintain a steady economic pressure on the socialist states to keep up with the arms race, thereby making it impossible for socialist living standards to compete with the West; and to provide an arms market paid for by the tax-payer in order to keep the market economy system from collapsing due to market saturation and shrinkage.

Without detente and genuinely safeguarded disarmament steps, the pressure cannot be released; effectively large disarmament measures and a decrease in the arms trade will fundamentally weaken the market economy system and strengthen the socialist system. Thus detente and disarmament are aspects of the class struggle on an international scale. The interests of the working class will be better served by a drastic cut in the

arms trade and the arms race on both sides. Hence the issue of a globalistic-humanistic consciousness is not contrary to the class struggle but an essential aspect of that struggle.

2. Economic Reforms -Capitulation to Market Economy?

M.A. Latif pulls no punches in asserting that already at the 20th Congress (February 1956), the greatest social revolution in history was reversed, and that the Soviet Union changed "from an avowed destroyer of capitalism into its admiring imitator". This "counter-revolutionary sweep of the Congress" made the world communist movement overnight into "a miserable reformist hawker of bourgeois parliamentarianism".

I can understand the latter statement in the India context. But I have difficulty with the first; it is true that a weakened post-war Soviet economy settled down to doctrines and strategies of detente and co-existence; it sought to avoid major confrontations with the West; it tried to imitate western technology and production methods; as contacts with the west developed through tourism and international exchange (both commercial and diplomatic), consumerism and commodity fetishism crept into the socialist system everywhere; concepts like peaceful transition to socialism gained ground. Granting all that and much more, it remains still difficult to concede that there was an abandoning of the socialist mode of production and property relations. It is true that leadership in socialist countries often succumbed to love of comfort and bourgeois style of life. But is it not also true that perestroika recognizes this evil and seeks to remedy it?

The economic reforms approved by the 27th CPSU Congress (1985) do involve partial privatisation of the production process and the introduction of what looks like the profit motive. The tension between the recognition of the market factor within a socialist economy on the one side and the continuing affirmation, on the other, of loyalty to a centrally planned system of socialist production does give occasion for legitimate anxiety. The newly introduced dialectic between Plan and Market has failed to carry total conviction.

To many, the other new dialectic between ideology and reality also sounds strange and dangerous. But can scientific socialism overlook reality in the interest of dogmas masquerading as ideology? The reality is that the present socialist mode of production has failed at the level of quality and efficiency. Can we set aside quality and efficiency of production as bourgeois values? It is real that the present pattern of centralized production has smothered cultural creativity among the people. Is it unmarxist to argue without cultural creativity and democratic freedom it would not be possible to develop an efficient and quality-oriented system of socialist production?

It is true that the Law on Enterprises and the Law on Cooperatives do introduce the profit motive as an incentive to production with efficiency of quality goods and services. Is that no capitulation to the central principle of the market economy system? One answer is that it is not the profit motive as such that forms the pivot of the capitalist system;

but rather profit through the appropriation of surplus value from wage labour. In so far as the new laws do not permit the employment of wage labour but insists on worker-owned family co-operatives, what is encouraged is still socialist collective labour without exploitation.

The new laws seem rather hastily put together and will probably need radical revision after a few years of actual practical experience. But they do not, according to many reasonable marxist thinkers, involve any capitulation to the market economy system in principle. This will probably continue as a matter for debate for some time.

3. CPSU Leadership of the World Communist Movement

An American marxist was telling to me the other day that they can no longer look to Moscow for leadership in the World communist movement, but will have to develop their own independent thinking and strategy. The argument was that the CPSU was so pre-occupied with political and economic problems of the Soviet Union, as to relegate assistance to and leadership of the world wide revolutionary movement to a much lower priority.

There is indeed some truth in such reflections and expressions of anxiety. But has the world revolutionary movement so far been too dependent on the CPSU for assistance and guidance as to lose its own local initiative? Not counting China, and to a certain extent in the Indian CPM as well as

Euro-communism in general, the dependence relationship has often led in many countries to a weakened contact with the local masses and their struggles and aspirations. Excessive Moscow dependence has been one of the factors in the rise of careerism in many leftist parties.

China's independent line has been more pragmatically oriented than Perestroika-glasnost. Within Chinese party circles there is even some questioning of marxism-leninism as an alien ideology as well as an attempt to formulate a new socialist ideology derived only partly from marxism-leninism and incorporating revised neo-Confucianist values and perceptions. Similar developments may take place in other leftist parties. In the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, on the other hand, a new ideology has already developed and is being pursued. Moscow has not been able to mitigate the personality cult already developed in North Korea as an integral part of this new ideology. Latin American leftist parties are also in the process of developing somewhat parochialistic socialist ideologies of liberation which substantially deviate from Orthodox marxism.

The CPSU knows that it cannot control or direct the world revolutionary movement. It is part of the new thinking to decrease the dependence and to permit freedom for development of revolutionary strategies related to varying cultural and socio-economic realities. It is difficult enough to control and co-ordinate revolutionary thinking within the Soviet Union itself. But the CPSU is not asking the various revolutionary

parties and movements to fend for themselves. They seem to be ready to seek a more democratic relationship among the progressive movements of the world. It is not the case that the first revolutionary state of socialism is lying aside its world leadership role. But that role will now be exercised on a more democratic and pluralistic style than before, in order to reduce parasitism and dependence relationships. This does not mean however that leftist parties of the Two-third world can no longer expect assistance from the CPSU and the Soviet Union. But that assistance will be administered in such a way as to promote greater self-reliance, more creativity in initiatives, and a more perceptive integration with the struggles and aspirations of national masses. Indian parties have to seize the initiative at this point and apply some perestroika to their own structures.

●. Soviet Military Power in Defence of Socialism elsewhere

Clearly in a socialist state like Poland, the reactionary groups are now testing the resolve of Soviet military power. The recrudescence of Solidarity and the Roman Catholic Church's more open identification with it seem to be based on the perception that Soviet military power will only be used as a last resort in checking reactionary movements. In Hungary and Czechoslovakia reactionary movements are more cautious, but they seem to be biding their time, watching developments in Poland.

The CPSU position appears to be that Eastern European socialist states should develop their own strength among the masses, and not depend on Soviet military power to sustain and promote socialism handed down from above.

Certainly the west will exploit this situation, and strategies for undermining socialism in Eastern Europe as a first step to overthrowing Soviet power are already well developed.

It is my understanding that the CPSU has not made any dogmatic decisions about the use of Soviet military might, but developing a strategy of "flexible response" in relation to the worldwide revolutionary movement.

5. Assessment of Stalin

The present CPSU assessment of Stalin seems totally negative. There is no mitigation of this judgment by recognition of some of his positive achievements during the resistance to Nazi aggression and in the post-war economic development in the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt that Stalinist atrocities and repression gave a lot of grist to the mill of world-wide anti-communism. Alas, too many people in the world think of Communism in terms of brutal assassinations, ruthless bloodshedding and repression of all civil liberties. Much of Stalinist excesses and personality cult can in no way find justification on marxist grounds.

The ethos of the Soviet Union today is rather emotionally anti-Stalin, and it has become difficult to say something positive about Stalin these days.

I believe it will be a major contribution if the leftist parties in India could achieve a more balanced assessment of Stalin, without playing down or justifying his inhuman treatment of his colleagues, the unnecessary killings, the institutions of correction, the disruption of mutual trust in Soviet society as a whole and so on.

6. Is Perestroika Revisionism?

On the surface the CPSU programme of Perestroika-Glasnost seems to have been made up of much that it previously condemned as revisionism and Dubcekian 'socialism with a human face'.

As far as I know, a full philosophical basis for Perestroika has not yet been developed by Soviet Marxist philosophers. Even veterans like Fedoseyev and Ambartsumov are hard put to provide such a well-reasoned Marxist-Leninist foundation for Perestroika, with a fundamental ontology and epistemology. Even the philosopher of Perestroika, Ivan T. Frolov, who has now become Gorbachev's advisor, has not so far as I know worked out such a Marxist-Leninist basis for the new thinking.

There is reason at present to avoid such fundamental thinking, because Marxism recognizes, though not openly, the

difficulties of such philosophical reasoning in terms of both ontology and epistemology.

The tendency therefore is largely to stay at a more pragmatic level of reflection. The humanism that is being developed reveals an uncomfortable kinship with western liberal humanism. Values and principles are affirmed without grounding them in fundamental reflection. Such pragmatism is the hall-mark of western bourgeois liberalism and the market economy system which it has spawned or which has spawned it.

There is no doubt in my mind that there can be no reconstruction without revision. But the sloganeering about revisionism in which CPSU previously engaged was itself probably based on mis-understandings about what constitutes authentic marxism. Marxism as scientific socialism cannot make the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin or one interpretation of that teaching into some kind of marxist-leninist dogma.

Scientific socialism cannot be dogmatic. It must constantly revise its theoretical base in order to account for and effectively deal with empirical historical and social phenomena as they progressively unfold themselves. However that theoretical base must have some essential continuity. Some points of reference like exploitation as appropriation of surplus value from wage-labour, the class struggle, the leading role of the working class, ownership of the means of production, the link between relations of production (political

economy) and the means of production (science-technology-organisation) etc. have to be preserved, for it is not possible to assess historical and social phenomena without a theoretical base derived from previous experience and reflection.

Terms like revisionism in a pejorative sense make no sense. Human reflection involves by necessity a dialectic between theory and practice. And good theory is one that is continually revised in relation to practice. Hence it is not much use debating whether Perestroika is revisionism. The more important question is whether Perestroika involves a fundamental departure, both in theory and practice, from the marxist-leninist tradition as it has developed through 140 years or so of world-wide experience and reflection. It seems too early to make a well-grounded answer to that question. But the debate must go on.

TOWARDS A PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
A PRELIMINARY EXPLORATION

(Paulos Mar Gregorios)

Since 1989 it has become difficult to speak in terms of a 'scientific socialism'. Marxism-Leninism did speak of itself as scientific socialism. The term referred sometimes to a dynamic set of theory and practice, and at other times to a particular socio-economic formation created by the law-governed forces of matter in historical development.

The universal model of 'scientific socialism' was the one evolved in the Soviet Union since 1917, though each nation had to create its own version of that model, adapted to local conditions. Today it is clearly acknowledged that the Soviet and European models did not work, led to stagnancy and stifling of creativity, and were basically anti-human. With the discrediting of the model, there comes about a radical questioning of the very possibility of a 'scientific socialism'.

However, many countries which were constrained by the forces of history to follow this model (more or less) for four decades or more and which have in 1989 consciously abjured this model, are now on the look-out for new models.

Time, however, is at a premium in this process of shaping new models. Hardly can one ask for the time needed to work out all the theoretical pre-suppositions for such a new model. Experimentation with new institutions and new relations has already begun in at least eight countries, beginning with China, and including the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and G.D.R., as also perhaps in Albania and Yugoslavia.

While these experiments are going on, incorporating elements of a market economy into what was previously a socialist economy in various stages of realisation, it may not be altogether idle to begin some work on the theoretical principles which should underlie these new societies. It is this work which we regard as leading, not to a revised scientific socialism, but to a provisional formulation of basic principles that I would call a philosophy of political economy. The building up of institutions and structures based on these principles will take time; in the meantime these principles can serve as a set of criteria by which to assess existing institutions and to project new institutions.

I would like to submit that there is no given methodology by which one can proceed to the formulation of these principles. Even acknowledged principles like human rights, democracy, justice peace and the integrity of the biosphere will need philosophical justification. Neither can one simply accept without criticism the stated and unstated principles of existing market economies.

Can one take some principle like "Global Humanism" and proceed to amplify its meaning and implications ? This is not only notoriously difficult, but often impractical, it now seems. Nor can we take one single thinker, like Marx or Gandhi and build on his thought. What about some religious scriptures like the New Testament, the Mosaic Law, the Quran, the Vedas or the Upanishads, the Gita or the Dhammapada ? These can of course be consulted, but no one of them can be made absolutely normative for the kind of pluralistic societies we envisage. But these do have a role- to which we must give attention.

I know there are many in the West who shy away from asking fundamental questions and are content to reduce such questions to a simple problem of political ethics. This is because they forget the groundedness of all ethical considerations on some more fundamental perceptions of reality.

And perhaps a good enough starting point for a significant political philosophy would be to examine some of the basic assumptions of both Marxism and Liberalism, hoping thereby to formulate some fundamental assumptions of our own.

I The Basic Assumptions of Yesterday's Marxism- Leninism

We have today no official spokes^{men} persons for Marxism-Leninism- no authoritative philosopher can even tell us today what Marxism-Leninism ought to be. We can only be very tentative therefore in stating its fundamental assumptions. I suggest that we ask the following five questions to both Marxism and Liberalism.

1. What is reality like ? (Ontology)
2. How do we know ? (Epistemology)
3. Where do we humans fit in, as knowers,
agents, etc ? (anthropology)
4. What is the role of the State and
other institutions ? (Political science)
5. How can we promote, direct and regulate
the free, creative power of the people ? (political
economics & culture)

I do not propose to answer these questions on behalf of Marxism or Liberalism. I can only point out some problems which we need to keep in mind, in answering these and other questions.

What is Reality like ? How do we know ?

Orthodox Marxism, till a few years ago, had a clear answer to this question. If you ask "what is there?", the answer would be "matter-energy, self-existent, infinite, auto-dynamic, auto-creative, in process of dialectical development". The formulation is my own, the content compiled from writings and conversations of competent marxist philosophers.

In a world where what was revisionism yesterday becomes Orthodoxy today, fundamental philosophers of marxism are understandably reluctant to discuss basic ontological and epistemological questions. They join, it would appear, in the western liberal camp at this point and are satisfied either with a strategy-oriented pragmatism or even the naive realism of liberalism.

We cannot, however, escape or evade these questions if we want to have a modicum of consistency in this regard. The self-existent matter-energy ontology has no scientific basis. Perceptive Marxist thinkers also know that atheism is as unscientific as theism. Even the great soviet anti-God journal "Religion and Science" today recognizes that. The assertion that matter-energy in process of development is what we observe, with our limited mental equipment, would be more scientific than any affirmations of science about theism or atheism.

But does western liberalism have a stronger foundation than cheap pragmatism and naive realism for its own ontological positions ? The answer is no. Liberalism finds strategies for evading the issue. The issues raised by quantum physics about the non-determinate character of the smallest units of reality as modern physics envisage them (particles-waves, and now quarks) do not yield to observer-independent objective study or expectations of law-regulated predictability.

I am not asking either Marxism or Liberalism to come forward with more precise and scientifically demonstrable ontologies. I am only asking them and others to be aware that such ontologies do not exist. Every ontology, whether naive realism or goal-governed pragmatism, is a leap of faith, which has no demonstrative proof: by their fruits Ye shall know them.

I will not go deeper here into the problem of ontology. I have pointed out the problem. It needs to be discussed, if only to make us aware of the fact that our social choices are rather arbitrary, and may even turn out to be quite foolish.

Neither do I want to dwell long on the problem of epistemology - the question of how we know and whether what we seem to know is reliable knowledge and to what extent. Marxism moved some years ago from the "copy theory" of Lenin to a revised epistemology which takes for granted that reality is faithfully reflected in the human social consciousness - again an assertion which has no scientific basis. Epistemology is that discipline

which shows us again how uncertain is that knowledge which we often take to be so certain.

These ontological and epistemological uncertainties of the scientific rational-critical method have direct consequences for our envisioning of a new model for political economy as we shall soon see.

II What is Man ?

In neo-marxism, the guiding analytical principle has become global humanism rather than historical materialism and the class struggle. The philosophers in the Soviet Union have in the last few years produced voluminous material on the human being in nature and the human being in society. President Gorbachev has even set up in Moscow an Institut Chelaveka or Institute for Humanum Studies, with Pravda editor I.T. Frolov as Chairman of the Board. I had the privilege last year of interviewing some of the researchers at this institute. If they had some idea on the methodology of humanum studies, they were unable to communicate such ideas to me.

Since human persons and societies are materially and phenomenologically present in our world, humanum studies could very well aspire to be scientific - unlike fundamental ontology and epistemology which have no phenomenological object. The best hypothesis which accounts for most observed facts, and which enables us to predict the way human beings in the aggregate do or should develop, would be the most scientific hypothesis on the humanum.

In doing this, however, we have to observe the human in all ~~his~~ three dimensions - personal, social and transcendent. And there begins the parting of the ways. Western liberalism

too often tries to give primacy to something called the "individual". I have tried to understand this word, which seems to be a culture-word of western bourgeois civilisation, for which many of our Asian languages lack a precise equivalent. Translated into Greek it becomes atom (atomos), which literally means indivisible or 'uncuttable'. Surely we do not have scientific justification for conceiving individuals as pre-existing society and therefore constituting it by something like a social contract. That mythical image of the social contract among equal individuals fitted in nicely with the interests of 19th century capitalism.

Today we know that no human being can become one except in society. Embryos^o may be developed in a glass dish, and infants can be given birth without two persons meeting socially. But an infant can grow up to be a human being only in society. Becoming a human being is essentially a social process, and without looking at the process itself we cannot draw up any theories of human becoming.

Hegel sought to provide a theory of human becoming (Menschwerdung). Menschwerdung is the German equivalent of Greek enanthropēsis or Incarnation, a theological concept. Hegel sought to reinterpret what he regarded as the myth of God

becoming Man in Christ Jesus in universal terms, as the Absolute Idea historically realizing itself in the Human Being.¹

For Hegel, the History of the World is God's history, i.e. history of the development and the realization of Geist, or God's Holy Spirit.² It is God as spirit, as freedom incarnate, that is being shaped and formed in history, as subject of the history of humanity. The State, even the monarchic state, for Hegel especially the monarchic Prussian state, is an embodiment of Geist, of Divine Reason in human social form.

We need to pay some attention to this contention of Hegel that the state does not arise from a social contract of the people, but from the embodiment of Divine Freedom with Virtue:

"A government of some kind, however, is always in existence. The question presents itself then, Whence did it (English government) emanate? Theoretically, it proceeded from the people; really and truly from the National Convention and its Committees. The forces now dominant are the abstract principles - Freedom, and, as it exists ~~when~~ within the limits of the Subjective Will - Virtue. This Virtue has now to conduct the

-
1. Hegel uses Menschwerdung in both senses in his Phaenomenologie des Geistes (Suhrkamp. 1973. see pages 505, 545, 552, 566f. 570)
 2. GWF Hegel, The Philosophy of History , (E.T.J. Sibree) Dover, New York, 1956 p. 457.

government in opposition to the Many, whom their corruption and attachment to old interests, or a liberty that has degenerated into license, and the violence of their passions, render unfaithful to Virtue" 3

Thus for Hegel, the Absolute Idea is Freedom with Virtue guiding the human will in history. Different forms of the state seek to embody it in human history. When either freedom or the good is compromised, the Spirit breaks out, destroying the old form of the state and creating a new one, through the fresh exercise of reason.

The French Revolution was the modal event of World History as Hegel saw and experienced it. Liberalism is the product of that event, and the principle of all modern states, according to Hegel.⁴ What compromised Liberty was religious slavery promoted by the Roman Church. The liberal state becomes rotten because of the fetters of church despotism, especially in the Latin countries of Europe.

3. Hegel, Philosophy of History op.cit. p. 450

4. ibid. p. 452

Becoming human, or Menschwerdung is an eminently political-social-economic process, which includes all social institutions, the State as well as the Church.⁵ But Freedom is always compromised. In the state, as also in the Church, the Few (the aristoi) emerge as power-wielders and suppress the freedom of the many, possessing property on behalf of the people and practising non-virtue. Here Reason revolts again, and the truly human asserts its nature as freedom-in-virtue; absolute self-determination (Eigensinn) through the Germanic (Barbarian) spirit which invaded the Roman Empire, destroyed the corrupt state, and made itself into a new Romanitas or Christianitas in Charlemagne's Christendom.

For Hegel, the German Spirit is the true spirit of freedom, as manifested in the Reformation, as well as in the development of the secular realm where freedom can develop without religious constraints.

All this history is part of humanity's becoming human - hominisation as Teilhard de Chardin called it. But finally and ultimately human becoming is an internal event,

5. See in this connection, Hans Kueng. Menschwerdung Gottes - Eine Einführung in Hegels theologisches Denken als Prolegomena zu einer künftigen Christologie, Herder, Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1970

a thought-⁶ event produced by thoughtwork, Denkarbeit, in the inner world of the Geist, not in the state or in organized religion, according to Hegel. This happens only when the human Self realizes its identity with the Absolute Idea: "das Selbst ist das absolute Wesen",⁶ more or less on an analogy with the Vedantic aham Brahmasmi (I am Brahman)

The Absolute has to be apprehended, not as substance, but as subject;⁷ the single human being experiences oneself as unmediated God ("Er ist der unmittelbar gegenwaertige Gott"), the local presence of the universal consciousness in determined existence. It is a feat of reinen Denkens , pure thought, by which the self, recognizing itself in the light of the other, becomes conscious of the other as of the same origin and comes back to the Self as the Self-for-others and Self-in-itself.

6. Hegel, Phaenomenologie, op.cit. p. 545

7. ibid p. 552

III The Marxian Overturning

Immediately after Hegel wrote the last pages of his Phenomenology there was thunder in Jena, the tranquil little university town of Weimar, the town of Fichte and Schelling, of Goethe and Hegel. Napoleon, as history on horseback, marched into and through Jena in 1806, ravaging and plundering.

Feuerbach and the Young Hegelians turned Hegel around, to the great delight of Marx, who was born 12 years after the Jena earthquake. As a young student at the university of Berlin, Marx had paid tribute to the Hegelian system:

"In this system - and herein is its great merit- for the first time, the whole world, natural, historical, intellectual, is presented as a process, i.e. as in constant motion, change, transformation, development; and the attempt is made to trace out the internal line that makes a continuous whole of all this movement and development". 8

But with the Young Hegelians, Marx developed his basic atheism, which dates back at least to his doctoral dissertation of 1841 at Jena in which he rejected Democritan atomism and

8. Marx and Engels, Selected Works in 3 vols
Moscow, Progress, 1973, Vol III p. 130

espoused Epicurean atheism, and human freedom based on the absence or non-being of God. Fear is the ground of unfreedom, especially fear of mythical beings. Epicurus "knows no other nature but the mechanical"⁹ according to the Young Marx. Nature was not an object of worship; the heavenly bodies have to be brought down to the same status as earthly bodies; they too are matter. Matter is the One; there is naught else.

"Epicurus is therefore the greatest representative of Greek Enlightenment, and he deserves the praise of Lucretius:

Humanity lay grovelling on earth
Before human eyes, crushed by the oppression of religion
Religion whose menacing head hovered over men from heaven
Striking horror into mortal minds;
Then a mortal man of Greece stood up in defiance
Standing erect with that defiant look
The gods of the fables did not crush him
Nor did heaven peal forth its thunder and lightning ..
Therefore behold, religion now lies prostrate and grovelling
We are the ones to triumph, level with the heavens" ¹⁰

This materialism-atheism of Marx is not too hard to refute. The refuting arguments will be of the same word-spinning and abstraction-weaving type as Epicurus or Hegel or Marx have used. Marx is so heavily dependent on Holbach's

9. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works
Vol. I Progress, 1975. p. 71

10. ibid p. 73 free English translation of Lucretius
present author's.

System of Nature,¹¹ which reflects a pet notion of Europe that all religion arises from a fear of the natural elements transferred to a mythical God.

I have dwelt at some length on this point because religious foundations are perhaps the most relevant single aspect that this lecture wants to dwell upon.

Western political philosophy traces its descent through the Greek philosophers to the Latin Varro¹² and the Latin North African Augustine. Augustine's City of God was written in instalments during the long period 413-426 A.D.

It was a time similar to what Eastern Europeans are now experiencing, when old institutions were crumbling and the new had not taken shape. Except that the collapse of the system involved a great deal of loss of life and property, on account of the descent of the Barbarians and the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 A.D.

11. London, 1770

12. Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 BCE) was a polymath whom Quintillian called "the most learned of the Romans", wrote 700 books, and laid the foundations of medieval European education. His De Philosophia lists 288 schools of Philosophy. Cf Augustine, City of God XIX:1

Augustine's City of God did not serve either as a political model or as a philosophy of history in his life-time. His contemporaries largely rejected Augustine's teachings, as not faithful to the gospel and to the received tradition.

More than 160 years later, Augustine's writings were promoted by the one the west calls St. Gregory the Great (540-604)^{AD} (neither the sainthood nor the greatness of Gregory is acknowledged by the non-Roman churches), who became Pope in 590. Son of a Roman Senator and himself Prefect of Rome before becoming a monk, Gregory decided to assert the imperial power of the western church over against the already devious imperial power of the Byzantine Greek church at Constantinople. He appointed governors for Italian cities and enacted laws for the ecclesiastical and civil realms backed only by the prestige of the Roman See in the vacuum left by the lack of a western Emperor. He was not only a great preacher, great ascetic, great writer, and great organizer. He was above all a holy man who was also one of the greatest of political power brokers in history. He was the one who popularized the ideas of Augustine and laid the foundations of Christian civilisation in the west. As Servus Servorum Dei, a title which Gregory appropriated for himself, he laid the foundations of an ecclesiastical imperium which has lasted to this day.

You celebrate Gregory's feast day on March 12th. This is a time to recognize how great a role the Papacy plays even today in changing history. Eastern Europe should recognize the key role played by Pope John Paul II in bringing down the "Yalta Communism" of the six East European countries in 1989- the communism from above imposed by the Yalta agreement of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin in 1945.

Marx over-turned what Gregory with the aid of Augustine had set up in the sixth and seventh centuries. Now Marx has been over-turned, at least in parts of Eastern Europe. Europe is on the verge of reconstructing the old Romanitas in a new form. That is what we hear when we hear of the European Home idea - Christentum- Romanitas in a new form of neo-colonial imperium aspiring to universal domination.

It is about this Marxian overturning of the Augustinian-Gregorian political economy and the current partial overturning of the Marxian political economy that I wish to make my main point, which I can only briefly state here.

IV The State and The Trans^cendent

This is the key issue of my paper. Does the State have or need any transcendent reference ? Can the secular realm be self-sufficient in providing the principles of a political economy ?

Plato, the spiritual father of the West did not think so. For him God is the beginning, the middle, and the end.¹³ Eternal justice is God's minister. Men who exalt themselves above this standard shall destroy themselves and their state. God is the measure of all things, not man, as some say.

What the Romans did was to reduce God to gods - little capricious powers who could be placated and from whom favours could be elicited by sacrifice. These gods Varro had defended as the foundation of Romanitas, and these gods the Christians had rejected. This reduction of God to gods one finds in Plato and later neo-platonism as well. Plato, in The Laws argues very strongly that a state ruled by those who have no sense of the Transcendent will be self-destructive.

13. Plato, The Laws 715-716

14. 837 ff.

Augustine made that cruel and mis-leading opposition of man and God by positing two cities - one Civitas Dei, i.e. of God, and another the City of the Earth or the City of Man. In Book# XV, Augustine makes the most unsophisticated and misleading polarisation:

"That (human) race we have divided into two classes, one that lives according to man and the other that lives according to God. In symbolic fashion we call these two cities, that is two communities of men, of which one is predestined to reign eternally with God, the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil". 14

Augustine's understanding of history is that it is the realm where the two cities co-exists, i.e. "the faithless, worldly city", and the "heavenly city" part of which is an earth as a pilgrim. The celestial city has nothing to do with the temporal laws of the earthly state; but does not break them. The heavenly city has its own peace, but respects the peace of the world:

"The earthly city, which does not live by faith, seeks an earthly peace, and therein ~~even~~ contrives a civic harmony of command and obedience ... The heavenly city, on the other hand, or rather that part of it that is a stranger on the earth and lives by faith, also uses that peace because it must, until the mortality that makes it necessary shall itself pass away" 16

-
14. Augustine, City of God : XV:I. Eng Tr.
J.W.C. Wand, London, OUP, 1963
15. ibid. XIX: XVII
16. XIX: XVII. op. cit. p. 348

Despite this unjustifiable separation of the City of God and the City of Man, Augustine had established the principle of Transcendence, by positing the Divine as existing side by side with the human, in a tenuous and non-integral co-existence of the two cities. As Pope Gregory and his successors shaped the European State, the City of God, represented by the Papacy, came to have authority over the City of Earth. What Europe did, to integrate the two disjunct cities of Augustine, was to place one under the other, and to derive the civil authority for the temporal state from God through the Pope. The Transcendent which hovered around the temporal in a somewhat loose way in Augustine, was anchored inside the Temporal as supreme, by making the state also God-derived. The Prince was now no longer deriving his authority from the temporal state, but from the divine source through the Papacy.

V. The State as Representation

Eric Voegelin, in his The New Science of Politics¹⁷ argues that the government represents the State, which in turn represents the people, organized into a body for corporate action. Representative here means both agent and image. Formerly Kings

17. University of Chicago press, 1952

used to represent the people and the state. Today institutions do that job. Voegelin says this is a peculiarity of Graeco-Roman and Western civilisations only - based on the prior articulation of the "individual" as a representable unit.¹⁸ This can be contested.

Voegelin says that in the great Far Eastern and Middle Eastern empires, this was not the case. These empires regarded themselves as representatives, or agents and images, not of the people, but of a transcendent divine order. He documents this from the Behistun Inscription, celebrating the feats of Darius I of Persia, who regarded himself as representative and tool of Asuramazda. The Mongol King Kuyuk Khan wrote in the 13th century to Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254), who invited the Khan to receive Christian baptism.

If you say, I am a Christian; I adore God;
I despise the others, How then shall you know
whom God forgives and to whom He grants His
mercy ? How do you know that you speak such
words ? By the power of God, from the rising
of the sun to its setting all realms have been
granted to us. Without the Order of God How
could anyone do anything"? 19

18. op. cit. p. 50

19. cited by E.Voegelin, op.cit. p. 57

The Asian monarchs and emperors did not make any claim to derive their authority from the people or to represent them. They claimed to represent God. This seems to have been the case in medieval Christendom also, though in the Graeco-Roman tradition, especially in Athenian democracy, the people-representation claim had been made.

What the modern, post-Enlightenment post- 1789, western world had done is to reject the monarchic principle of God-representation, and replace it with the democratic principle of people-representation.

This democratic principle is only one strand in the western tradition. The Romanitas and Christentum traditions are clearly that of integrating the divine and the human in the social order. Augustine separated them, but they came back together again in medieval Christendom. In the Romanitas tradition the Pontifex is the bridge-builder between the divine and the human. Cicero recognizes this and in his De natura deorum philosophically justifies the divine-human nature of civil society, as the original situation until the charm was broken by the mysticism of the individual and the secularisation of society. This was also the earlier Greek society reflected in Homer and Hesiod - a community of close interaction between gods and humans. Even Alexander of Macedonia, who got his inspiration from the Persian Conquerors,

was not a believer in Athenian democracy. Neither was that democracy totally secular. Alexander's mentor, Aristotle, himself thought the rule of the many pretty bad, one is the Lord" 20

The Christians did not dedivinize the social order; they only drove out the many gods of Rome, and put the one God of Jews and Christians in their place. Only gradually did the Triune God of the Christians take the place of the one God of the Jews as the author of taxis or civil order.

What Augustine or using him Pope Gregory did, was to dedivinize the civil order and to concentrate divinity in the ecclesiastical order - thus paving the way for the civil order to assert its total independence of the ecclesiastical order in the French Revolution, the Enlightenment and the process of secularisation.

Eric Voegelin does not think that the secular order began with the French Revolution and the European Enlightenment of the 18th century. He thinks it began much earlier in a re-birth of Gnosticism. It was western Christianity which dedivitized the temporal order, by transferring divinity to the Church by Augustine.

But Charlemagne's Christendom built back the transcendent into the State, by the identification Romanitas=Christianitas = Christian Roman Empire of Charlemagne and his successors. The State was re-divinised by medieval Christendom; assumed by Byzantium earlier, and after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, by Moscow, the Third Rome.

The European Enlightenment, the French Revolution and the Process of Secularisation - all these mark a new de-divinisation of that which had been re-divinised. In that process, the transcendent is demesticated. The people take the place of the transcendent God as the ultimate source and authority for all power. This overthrow of the Transcendent in order to affirm the sovereignty of the Human is what undergirds both products of the European Enlightenment - Democratic Liberalism and Marxism-Leninism.

In the common European Home, where Marxists and Liberals are now to come together for a new programme of power-seeking and world domination, one doubts whether the the old bourgeois trick of the European Enlightenment will still work.

In Kant's small but powerful essay on "What is the Enlightenment ?" he defines it as the assertion of adulthood by humanity, a humanity which only because of its timidity

failed to come into its own inheritance as sovereign humanity. He, however, immediately goes on to say that such sovereignty can be exercised only by the "educated class", i.e. by middle class people with Bildung.

When the European Home people speak of a Global Humanism, I suspect that in the back of their minds, they regard European humanity as the true adult humanity. They may be willing to recognize by painful necessity, the Americans and perhaps the Japanese also as nearing maturity. But the rest of humanity like Asia and Africa particularly, and also Latin America (which is largely European) will need a long period of European tutelage before they become mature enough, adult enough, to handle the great responsibility of human sovereignty.

Global humanism in principle; but in practice, however, only a part of humanity, the technologically and industrially advanced humanity can exercise leadership of that humanity. This principle is not always acknowledged in theory, but is implied in much of planning and action - in the economic and political policies of all industrially developed societies, including socialist societies like the USSR and ex-socialist societies like those of Eastern Europe. China does not quite go along that line.

V. The Secular and The Sovereignty
of the People

I think both principles of European civilisation - the secular perspective on reality as self-existent and non-transcendent, and the affirmation of the sovereignty of the people which goes with the secular perspective - need thorough questioning and re-examination, before the principles on which to found a political economy can be formulated.

The secular assumption is one of the most fatuous assumptions made by European civilisation, which has ^{thereby} fundamentally distorted all our human institutions including the State and the Academy. The dichotomisation of reality into sacred and secular was a direct consequence of Augustine's polarisation of the divine and the human.

Feuerbach (1804-1872) stated it in his own terms, when he denied Hegel's notion of the pre-existence of the Absolute Idea or other logical categories before material evolution began. He was right in stating that Hegel's Absolute Idea was a philosophical term which served as a surrogate for the traditional belief in God.

Friedrich Engels put it this way:

"With irresistible force Feuerbach is finally driven to the realization that the Hegelian pre-mundane existence of the Absolute Idea, the 'pre-existence of the logical categories' before the world existed, is nothing more than the fantastic survival of the belief in the existence of an extra-mundane creator; that the material, sensuously perceptible world to which we ourselves belong is the only reality." 21

The Feuerbachian reduction of the Transcendent to be identical with the future of humanity lies at the heart of modern secular culture in both its forms - Marxism and Liberal Democracy.

No philosophy of political economy can really escape this fundamental issue.↵ The immanentist eschatology, i.e. the claim that the transcendence of God is identical with the future of humanity has its background in European civilisation's desperate drive to bring everything (including God) under the firm grip of its cognitio. Hegel brought the Absolute Idea within human cognition, and made that cognition, in its final state, the final fulfilment of the Absolute Idea itself, as it works out its potentiality into actuality in natural and human history.

In western civilisation we can trace three attempts to domesticate God within the human - (a) the intellectual,

21. Lewis S. Feuer, ed. Marx and Engels, Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy, Doubleday Anchor, 1959. p. 210

theoretical, exemplified by Hegel and Schelling, (b) the aesthetic-emotional, exemplified by Pentecostal sects, and (c) the volitional-activistic exemplified by Marxism Liberal Democracy and National Socialism.

Religious Fundamentalism keeps the transcendent as transcendent, but by making the religious leadership the custodians of the transcendent, makes another pernicious kind of domestication of the Transcendent possible. At the moment this tendency is very strong in many religions, but noticeably so in Iranian and Saudi Arabian Islam, in some forms of resurgent Hinduism, Irish Roman Catholicism, Jewish Zionism, Khalistani Sikhism, and Sri Lankan Buddhism, to cite a few of the more obvious fundamentalisms.

Subtler forms of this attempt to domesticate the Transcendent can be seen also in the varieties of self-understanding of various expansionist cultures: e.g. Moscow as Third Rome, America's Manifest Destiny and China's Celestial Kingdom, all of which are used to justify forms of quest for hegemony, imperialism and world domination.

Immanuel Kant, who in a philosophical sense is very much the Father and Prophet of the European Enlightenment, did not go as far as the domestication of the Transcendent

in future human history, primarily because his basic standpoint was characteristically bourgeois and centred in the individual mind rather than in human history as a community experience.

Kant did this by refusing to yield the teleological principle of understanding nature to the ambitions of the mechanical-causal principle of modern science. For him the purposiveness of nature is an a priori concept,²² not one to be demonstrated by the empirical methods of science. The purposiveness of nature is a transcendental deduction of the critique of judgment. And Kant insists that the order of nature cannot be understood without the a priori principle of purposiveness. The teleological judgment about the purpose of nature (or the purpose of the created order as understood by us, if we speak in non-Kantian Christian theological terms) should form an integral part of any philosophy of political economy. For Kant this purposiveness can be understood only in a transcendental dimension:

"In other words, nature, considered as mere mechanism, could have produced its forms in a thousand other ways without stumbling upon the unity which is in accordance with such a principle. It is not in the concept of nature but quite apart from it that we can hope to find the least ground a priori for this" 23

22. See Kant, Critique of Judgment Eng. Tr. J.H. Bernard, Macmillan, 2nd ed. revised, pp. 20ff.

23. 1. Kant, Critique of Judgement, op.cit. p. 260

It is reflection (for it is not a matter for empirical science) on this purposiveness of the whole that the European Enlightenment tradition has neglected. The result is that the purpose of the whole has been replaced by partial purposes of human communities- like the establishment of national power, or imperium, or dominum terrae and so on. Liberal Democracy certainly operates on the pragmatic, arbitrary human choice of what a section of humanity wants. Marxism on the other hand defines the purpose of the whole as the establishment of the classless society, a stateless, creative, human community in history; it thus does not, at least in theory, fall into the trap of making parochial pragmatism and provincialist greed for domination its final purpose.

But Marxism too has domesticated the transcendent purpose of the created order in accordance with a 19th century perception of the final goal of human history. Kant was very keen on affirming the transcendent character of the whole. The whole is not the cause of the part as we understand causality:

"To speak strictly ... the organisation of nature has in it nothing analogous to any causality we know" ²⁵

24. op.cit p. 277-278

25. ibid p. 280

The point of Kant is that

- (a) Reason is not a mere mechanism of nature;
- (b) Nature is not mechanical, but a purposive entity which cannot be understood apart from its purpose;
- (c) Nature is a system of purposes, and it is the function of human Reason to go beyond what Pure Reason can do (i.e. scientific, mechanical-causal explanation) to discern the nature of the purposiveness of nature, and to fulfil the creative human role within it in imagination, creativity and moral freedom.

Kant goes on then to formulate the two "constitutive principles of the possibility of Objects;

"Proposition All production of material things is possible according to merely mechanical laws;
counter-proposition: some production of material things is not possible according to merely mechanical laws" 26

The two principles seem to be in conflict, in contradiction, looking like an antinomy in Reason itself. Kant says, however, that it is not so; but that we should go along with the first principle as far as it takes. Beyond

that we need a different principle for assessing final causes. This cannot be given by experience-based use of pure reason; humanity needs to reflect.

And as humanity has reflected, according to Kant, two sets of systems have emerged - Idealism and Realism. These systems, do not, however, provide that which they pretend to. Kant refers to the system of Epicurians, who accept the idea of purposiveness in nature but deny intentionality. This is the system which Marx defended in his doctoral dissertation. Blind chance, or total randomness, is sufficient cause to explain what looks like purposiveness in nature, according to Epicurus and Marx.

According to Kant Christian Theism, with the hylozoism it implies, does not give the philosophical ground for purposiveness either; though it is superior to all other grounds of explanation,²⁷ it still remains non-objective as a judgment²⁸. It cannot be proved, not even by a future Newton.

It is at this point that Kant goes beyond critical judgment to pure speculation. Culture, the creativity of human beings in accordance with chosen purposes, does not

27. pp 308-309

28. pp. 311-312

surrender its freedom to any a priori rules as to how it should function. These choices of humanity are made, however, not primarily by an individual, but by the civil community which regulates the abuse of the conflicting freedoms of individuals.

The climax of Kant's argument is that there is a final purpose for the very existence of the world; final purpose here means for Kant much more than what Aristotle put into that notion. A final purpose "needs no other as the condition of its possibility"²⁹, i.e. the world exists because of its Idea - the idea of the highest good, in freedom. This final purpose is humanity, not as a phenomenon, but as a noumenon. Only human beings are capable of freedom in purposes, and so only in Man can the world achieve its purpose. This purpose of both world and humanity can exist only in an intelligent "World Cause (as highest artist)" but such a First Cause is not open to Pure Reason; it is a fundamental a priori of human consciousness.

29. pp 360-361

• And here Kant provided a moral proof for the Being of God, a proof which has not stood the test of time and has therefore been largely abandoned. It was a subjective argument which Kant knew to be not logically compelling; it was an appeal which could find a positive response from a moral being, one who acknowledges duties and responsibilities and therefore a moral law to which one is bound by nature. A morally sensitive person can recognize that the ground of the moral law one observes in one's own nature is a divine command.

Today we recognize how weak Kant's argument is. It comes at the end of his Third Critique, and almost seems like an appendix which Kant added to escape the charge of Atheism (or to please his servant who complained about Kant's Critiques doing away with God). The Father of the European Enlightenment did not want a secular perception of the world, i.e. the idea that the world can be understood without reference to any entity transcending it. Kant was not "secular" as many children of the Enlightenment have become.

I am here concerned, not with the weakness or strength of Kant's arguments, nor with his personal beliefs. What I am concerned is the acceptance of the secular principle as the basis of modern western civilisation. I can understand

the historical circumstances under which the original anti-secular principle of the modern western state - i.e. cuius regio eius religio (as king, so religion) has been repudiated and replaced by the other western political principle of separation of church and state. I can understand secularisation as a social, spiritual, intellectual process by which the domination of religion has been beaten back by the assertion of human freedom.

But I cannot understand the driving out of God from academic science (as not a 'necessary hypothesis') and from the State (secular state). If God is really the source and foundation of all existence, how can there be a science or state in which that source and foundation of all existence, ~~how can there be a science or state~~ in which that source and foundation has no relevance ?

Let me repeat - for me both the idea of the secular and the idea of the sovereignty of the people are ideas without foundation, mistaken ideas, based on arguments much weaker than the one advanced by Kant as moral argument for the existence of God. Modern Science is foundationally wrong, in so far as it pretends to explain everything without reference to God, by positing a self-existent, auto-developing "nature" which it then

proceeds to explain by its causal laws. The modern state, whether Marxist or Liberal Democratic, is foundationally wrong, in so far as it affirms the principle of the sovereignty of the people, because there is absolutely no evidence, either in practice or in theory, that the people ever have been or will be sovereign.

Conclusion

We as humanity are at a great cross-roads. We need to understand the nature of the choices facing us.

In relation to what is happening and has happened in the Eastern part of Europe and in the Soviet Union, I can inhesitatingly make the following affirmations:

(a) The model of Marxist-Leninist~~n~~ Socio-economic and political development initiated by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 has not stood the test of time.

(b) what was previously condemned by Orthodox Marxism-Leninism as "bourgeois revisionism" is now becoming official doctrine for some socialist countries, including China and the Soviet Union.

(c) This does not mean a total discounting of the socialist experiment; some values established in socialism are now becoming increasingly normative even for market economies, e.g. a full employment society, the imperative to make education, health food, housing, clothing, communication and transport equitably accessible to all people according to need, whatever their economic and social status, geographical location, or religious, ideological and political convictions. Social justice has been demonstrated to be a goal to be pursued in all societies. People have become aware of the moral

condemnability of domination, oppression, exploitation and great inequalities in standard of living. No political philosophy today can afford to ignore these basic norms.

(d) The triumph of market economy capitalism is extremely temporary. Faced with the presence and challenge of socialism, the market economy system has developed highly sophisticated ways of overcoming crises. But the contradictions of capitalism are intrinsic, and the system is bound to collapse by the weight of its own internal contradictions, sooner or later. Its temporary triumph, however, is quite substantial and in the countries of Eastern Europe, where the knowledge of the market economy has been from a distance, capitalism has won millions of open supporters. It also has received an enormous boost by the opening up of new investment and market possibilities in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and China. It can go on for a while, even if there is no substantial increase in military budgets of nations.

(e) By dint of sheer historical necessity new economies will develop which are mixtures of some socialist principles and practices mixed with prominent

market economy features. Only the propositions of socialist and capitalist elements will vary in these new economies as well as the establishment economies like those of U.S.A. Germany and Japan, as well as the E.C. Pure capitalism is a thing of the past. Pure socialism is still a thing of the future.

(f) The challenge that shows no signs of being met is to create new models of political economies based on our present insights about the nature of the world as process and of human beings in it. It may take quite a while before the incipient questioning of the values of the European Enlightenment the mechanistic and largely anti-human paradigm of scientific-technological development, and the fatuous and fallacious secular assumption will lead to the devising of totally new political economic models. Pushing that questioning to some creative levels is the present challenge before a philosophy of political economy.

Towards a Philosophy of Political Economy

A Preliminary Exploration

(Paulos Mar Gregorios)

Since 1989 it has become difficult to speak in terms of a 'scientific socialism'. Marxism-Leninism did speak of itself as scientific socialism; ~~and~~ ^{sometimes} the term referred ^{at times} to a dynamic theory and practice, and at other times to a particular socio-economic formation created by the law-governed forces of matter in historical development. The ^{universal} model of 'scientific socialism' was the one evolved in the Soviet Union since 1917, ^{though each nation had to} ^{Today} it is clearly acknowledged that the ^{Soviet and European} models ^{did} ~~does~~ not work, ~~is~~ led to stagnancy and stifling of creativity, and ~~was~~ ^{were} basically anti-human. With the discrediting of the model, there comes about a radical questioning of the very possibility of a 'scientific socialism'.

However, many countries which were constrained by the forces of history to follow this model (more or less) ^{which} for four decades or more and have in 1989 ^{lined} this model, are now

the model adapted to local conditions

Time, however, is at a premium in this process of shaping new models. Hardly can one ask for ^{the needed} time to work out all the theoretical pre-suppositions for such a new model. Experimentation with new institutions and new relations has already begun in ^{at least} ~~all~~ eight countries, beginning with China, and including the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and G.D.R., as also perhaps in Albania and Yugoslavia.

While these experiments are going on, incorporating elements of a market economy into what was previously a socialist economy in various stages of realisation, it may not be altogether idle to begin some work on the theoretical principles which should underlie these new societies. It is this work which we regard as leading, not to a revised scientific socialism, but to a ^{basic} ~~flexible~~ ~~provisional~~ formulation of principles that I would call a philosophy of political economy. The building up of institutions and structures based on these principles will take time; in the meantime these principles can serve as a set of criteria by which to assess existing ^{and to project} institutions.

/ I would like to submit that there is no given methodology by which one can proceed to the formulation of these principles. Even acknowledged principles like human rights, democracy, justice, peace and the integrity of the biosphere will need philosophical justification. Neither can one simply accept without criticism the stated and unstated principles of existing market economies.

Can one take some principle like "Global Humanism" and proceed to amplify its meaning and implications? This is not only notoriously difficult, but often impractical, it now seems. Nor can we take one single thinker, like Marx or Gandhi and build on his thought. What about some religious scriptures like the New Testament, the Mosaic Law, the Quran, the Vedas or the Upanishads, the Gita or the Dhammapada? These can of course be consulted, but no one of them can be made absolutely normative for the kind of pluralistic societies we envisage. But these do have a role - to which we ~~shall refer~~ must give attention.

I know there are many in the West who shy away from asking

to reduce such questions to a simple
of political ethics. This is because they
forget the groundedness of all ethical
considerations on some more fundamental
perceptions of reality

And perhaps a good enough
starting point for a significant political
philosophy would be to examine ^{some of} the
basic assumptions of ^{both} Marxism and
liberalism, hoping thereby to ^{formulate} ~~make~~
some fundamental assumptions ~~of~~ of
our own.

I The Basic Assumptions of Yesterday's Marxism-Leninism.

We have today no official spokes~~person~~^{persons} for Marxism-Leninism - no authoritative philosopher can even tell us today what Marxism-Leninism ^{ought to be} ~~is~~. We can only be very tentative therefore in stating its fundamental assumptions. I suggest that we ask the following questions to both Marxism and liberalism.

1. What is reality like? (Ontology)
2. How do we know? (Epistemology)
3. Where do we fit in, as ^{humans} knowers, agents, etc? (anthropology)
4. What is the role of the state ^{and other institutions}? (political science)
5. How ~~do~~ ^{can} we ^{promote direct} generate and regulate the free, ~~the~~ creative power ^{of the people?} ~~of~~ (political economics) & culture?

I do not propose to answer these questions on behalf of Marxism or Liberalism. I can only point out some problems which we need to keep in mind, in answering these and other questions.

I. I. & What is Reality like? How do we know?

Orthodox Marxism, till a few years ago, had a clear answer to this question. ~~is~~ If you ask "What is there?", the answer would be "matter-energy, self-existent, ^{infinite}, auto-dynamic, auto-creative, in process of dialectical development." The formulation is my own, the content compiled from writings and conversations of competent marxist philosophers.

In a world where what was revisionism yesterday becomes orthodoxy today, fundamental philosophers of marxism are understandably reluctant to discuss ^{basic} ontological and epistemological questions. • They join, it would appear, in the western liberal camp at this point and ~~are~~ ^{are} satisfied either with a strategy-oriented pragmatism or even the naive realism of liberalism.

We cannot, however, escape or evade these questions if we ~~to~~ want to have a modicum of consistency in this regard. The self-existent matter-energy ontology has no scientific basis. Perceptive Marxist thinkers also know that atheism is as unscientific as theism. Even the great Soviet anti-God journal "Religion and Science" today recognizes that. The assertion that matter-energy is in process of development is what we

would be more scientific than any affirmation of science about theism or atheism.

But does western liberalism have a stronger foundation than ^{cheap} pragmatism and naive realism for its own ontological positions? The answer is no. Liberalism finds strategies for evading the issue. The ^{issues} ~~questions~~ raised by quantum ^{physics} ~~mechanics~~ about the non-determinate character of the smallest units of reality as modern physics envisage them (particles-waves, and now quarks) do not yield to observer-independent objective study or ~~total~~ expectations of law-regulated predictability.

I am not asking either Marxism or liberalism to come forward with more precise and scientifically demonstrable ontologies. I am only asking them and others to be aware that such ontologies do not exist. Every ontology, whether naive realism or goal-governed pragmatism, is a leap of faith, which has no demonstrative proof: by their fruits ye shall know them.

I will not go deeper here into the problem of ontology. I have pointed out the problem. It needs to be discussed, if only to make us aware of the fact that our ~~own~~ arbitrary and

Neither want to dwell long on the problem of epistemology - the question of how we know and whether what we seem to know is reliable knowledge and to what extent. Marxism moved some years ago from the copy theory of Lenin to a revised epistemology which takes for granted that reality is faithfully reflected in the human social consciousness - again an assertion which has no scientific basis. Epistemology is that discipline which shows us again how uncertain ^{is} that knowledge which we often take to be so certain.

These ontological and epistemological uncertainties of the scientific rational-critical method have direct consequences for our envisioning of a new model for political economy as we shall soon see.

I 3. 11 What is Man?

In neo-marxism, the guiding analytical principle has become global humanism rather than historical materialism and the class struggle. The philosophers in the Soviet Union have in the last few years produced voluminous material on the human being in nature and the human being in society. President Gorbachev has even set up in Moscow an Institute Lelavetka or Institute for Humanum Studies, with Pravda editor I. T. Frolov as Chairman of the Board. I had the privilege last year of interviewing some of the researchers at this institute. If they had some idea on the methodology of humanum studies, they were unable to communicate such ideas to me.

Since human persons and societies are materially ^{and phenomenologically} present in our world, humanum studies could very well aspire to be scientific — unlike ^{fundamental} ontology and epistemology ^{which have no phenomenological object}. The best hypothesis which accounts for most observed facts, and which enables us to predict the way human beings ^{do or should} in the aggregate ^{develop}, would be the most scientific hypothesis on the humanum. In doing this, however, we have

parting of the ways. Western liberalism too often tries to give primacy to something called the "individual". I have tried to understand this word, which seems to be a culture-word of western bourgeois civilisation, for which many of our Asian languages lack a precise equivalent. Translated into Greek it becomes atom (atomos), which literally means indivisible or 'uncuttable'. Surely we do not have scientific justification for conceiving individuals as pre-existing society and therefore constituting it by something like a social contract. That myth image of the social contract ^{among} equal individuals fitted in nicely with the interests of 19th century Capitalism.

Today we know that no human being can become one except in society. Embryos may be developed in a glass dish and infants can be given birth without two persons meeting socially. But an infant can grow up to be a human being only in society. Becoming a human being is essentially a social process, and witho looking at that process itself we cannot draw up any theories of human becom.

Hence I sought to provide a

Menschwerdung is the German equivalent of Greek enanthropēsis or Incarnation, a theological concept. Hegel sought to reinterpret what he regarded as the myth of God becoming Man in Christ Jesus in universal terms, as the Absolute Idea ^{historically} realizing itself in the Human Being.¹

For ~~God~~ Hegel, the History of the World is God's history, i.e. history of the development and the realization of Geist, or God's Holy Spirit.² It is God as Spirit, as freedom incarnate, that is being shaped and formed in history, ^{as Subject of} ~~the~~ the history of humanity. The State, even the monarchic Prussian state, is an embodiment of Geist, of Divine Reason in human social form.

We need to pay some attention to his contention of Hegel that the state does not arise from a social contract of the people, but from the embodiment of Divine Freedom with Virtue:

1. Hegel uses Menschwerdung in both senses in his Phaenomenologie des Geistes (Suhrkamp. 1973. See pages 505, 545; 552, 566f. 570)

2. ^{GWFF} Hegel, The Philosophy of History, (E.T. J. Sibree) 1956 p 457.

is always in existence. The question presents itself then, Whence did it ^(English government) emanate? Theoretically, it proceeded from the people; really and truly from the National Convention and its committees. The forces now dominant are the abstract principles - Freedom, and, as it exists within the limits of the Subjective Will - Virtue. This Virtue has now to conduct the government in opposition to the Many, whom their corruption and attachment to old interests, or a liberty that has degenerated into license, and the violence of their passions, render unfaithful to Virtue." 13

Thus for Hegel, the Absolute Idea is Freedom, with Virtue guiding the human will ^{in history}. ~~It either~~ is Different forms of the State seek to embody it in ^{human} history when either freedom or the good ~~one~~ is compromised, the Spirit breaks out, destroying the old form of the State and creating a new one, through the fresh exercise of reason.

The French Revolution was the nodal event of World History as Hegel saw and experienced it. Liberalism is the product of that event, and the principle of all

3. Hegel, Philosophy of History op. cit. p. 450

modern states, according to Hegel.⁴ What compromised liberty was Religious slavery promoted by the Roman Church. The liberal State becomes rotten because of the fetters of church despotism, especially in the Latin countries of Europe. ✓

Becoming human, or Menschwerdung is an eminently political-social-economic process, which includes all social institutions the State as well as the Church.⁵ But Freedom is always compromised. In the State, as also in the Church, the Few (the aristoi) emerge as power-wielders and suppress the freedom of the many, possessing property on behalf of the people and practising non-virtue. Here Reason revolts again, and the truly human asserts its nature as freedom-in-virtue; ~~and~~ absolute self-determination (Barbarian) (Eigensinn) through the Germanic Spirit which invaded the Roman Empire, destroyed ^{the corrupt} ~~the~~ state and made itself into a new Romanitas or Christianitas in Charlemagne's Christendom.

For Hegel, the German Spirit is the true Spirit of freedom, as manifested in the Reformation, as well as in the development of the secular realm where freedom can develop without religious constraints.

4. ibid. p. 452

5. See in this connection, Hans Kueng. Menschwerdung Gottes — Eine Einführung in Hegels theologisches Denken ~~also~~ als Prolegomena zu einer

All this history is part of humanity's becoming human - humanisation as Teilhard de Chardin called it. But finally and ultimately human becoming is an internal event, a thought-event produced by thought work, Denkarbeiten, in the inner world of the Geist, not in the State or in organized religion, according to Hegel. This happens only when the human Self realizes its identity with the Absolute Idea: "das Selbst ist das absolute Wesen"⁶, more or less on an analogy with the Vedantic aham Brahmasmi (I am Brahman).

The Absolute has to be apprehended, not as substance, but as subject; the single human being experiences oneself as unmediated God ("Er ist der unmittelbar gegenwaertige Gott"), the local presence of the universal consciousness in determined existence. It is a feat of reinen Denkens, pure thought, by which the Self, recognizing itself in the light of the Other, becomes conscious of the Other ^{and so as of the same origin} and comes back to the Self as the Self-for-Others and Self-in-itself.

6. Hegel, Phaenomenologie, op. cit. p 545

72

11.11.11

p. 552

111 The Marxian Overturning

Immediately after Hegel wrote the last pages of his Phenomenology there was thunder in Jena, the tranquil little university town of Weimar, ~~which had produced the town of~~ Fichte and Schelling, of Goethe and Hegel. Napoleon, as history on horseback, marched into and through Jena in 1806, ravaging and plundering.

Feuerbach and the Young Hegelians turned Hegel around to the great delight of Marx, who was born 12 years after the Jena earthquake. ~~As a~~ ^{As a} young student at the University of Berlin, Marx paid tribute to the Hegelian system:

"In this system - and herein is its great merit - for the first time the whole world, natural, historical, intellectual, is presented as a process, i.e. as in constant motion, change, transformation, development; and the attempt is made to trace out the internal line that makes a continuous whole of all this movement and development." 8

But with the Young Hegelians, Marx developed his basic atheism, which dates back at least to his doctoral dissertation of 1841 at Jena in which he rejected Democritean atomism

8. Marx and Engels, Selected Works in 3 vols
Moscow, Progress, 1973, Vol III p. 130

and espoused Epicurean Atheism, and human freedom based on the absence or non-being of God. Fear is the ground of unfreedom, especially fear of mythical beings. Epicurus "knows no other nature but the mechanical" according to the Young Marx. Nature was not an object of worship; the heavenly bodies have to be brought down to the same status as earthly bodies; they too are matter. Matter is the One; there is naught else.

"Epicurus is therefore the greatest representative of Greek Enlightenment,"¹⁰ and he deserves the praise of Lucretius:

Humanity lay grovelling on earth
Before human eyes, crushed by the oppression
of religion
Religion whose menacing head hovered over
Striking horror into ~~human~~ ^{mortal} minds;
Then a man of Greece stood up in
defiance
Standing erect with that defiant look
The gods of the fables did not crush him
Nor did heaven peal forth its thunder
and lightning....
Therefore behold, religion now lies prostrate
and grovelling
We are the ones to triumph, level with the
heavens" ¹¹

This materialism - atheism of Marx is not too hard to refute. The refuting arguments will be of the same word-spinning and abstraction-wearing type as Epicurus or Hegel or Marx have used. Marx is so heavily dependent on Holbach's

9. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works
Vol I. Progress, 1975. p. 71.

10 9. ibid p. 73. free English translation, of Lucretius

System of Nature¹⁰, which reflects a perception of Europe that all religion arises from a fear of the natural elements transferred to a mythical god.

I have dwelt at some length on this point because ^{religious foundations are} ~~it is~~ perhaps the most relevant single aspect that this lecture wants to dwell upon.

Western political philosophy traces its descent through the Greek philosopher to the Latin Varro¹² and the Latin North African Augustine. Augustine's City of God was written in instalments during the long period 413-426 A.D.

It was a time similar to what Eastern Europeans are now experiencing, when old institutions were crumbling and the new had not taken shape. Except that the collapse of the system involved a great deal of loss of life and property, on account of the descent of the Barbarians and the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 A.D.

Augustine's City of God did not serve either as a political model or as a philosophy of history in his life-time. ~~It was much later, a century later that~~ His contemporaries largely rejected Augustine's teachings, as not faithful to the Gospel and to the received tradition.

¹¹ 170? London, 1770

¹² Marcus Terentius Varro^(116-27 BCE) was a polymath whom Quintilian called "the most learned of the Romans", wrote 700 books, and laid the foundations of

More than a ~~Century~~ later,
Augustine's writings were promoted by
the one the West calls St. Gregory the Great (540-603 AD)
(neither the ~~Saint~~ nor the greatness ^{of Gregory} is
acknowledged by the non-Roman churches), who
became Pope in 590. Son of a Roman Senator
and himself Prefect of Rome before becoming a monk,
Gregory decided to assert the imperial power
of the ^{Western} Church over against the ^{already obvious} imperial power
of the Byzantine Greek Church at Constantinople. He
appointed ^{for Italian cities} governors and enacted laws for the
ecclesiastical and civil realms backed only by the prestige of the
Roman See in the vacuum left by the lack of a
Western Emperor. He was ^{not only} a great preacher, an
ascetic, great writer, and great organizer. He was
above all a holy man who was also one of
the greatest of political power brokers in history.
He was the one who popularized the ideas
of Augustine and laid the foundations of
Christian civilisation in the West. As ~~Servus~~
Servus servorum Dei, a title which
Gregory appropriated for himself, he laid
the foundations of an ecclesiastical
imperium which has lasted to this day.

You celebrate Gregory's feast
day on March 12th. This is a time to
recognize how great a role the Papacy plays
even today in changing history. Eastern Europe should
recognize the key role played by Pope John Paul
in bringing down the "Yalta Communism" of
the six East European countries in 1989 - the
"Iron Curtain" imposed by the Yalta
Conference.

Marx over-turned what Gregory with the aid of Augustine had set up in the ~~seventh~~ sixth and seventh ~~century~~ centuries. Now Marx has been over-turned, at least in parts of Eastern Europe. Europe is on the verge of reconstructing the old Romanitas in a new form. That is what we hear when we hear of the European ~~Home~~ ^{new colonial} idea Christianum-Romanitas in a new form of imperium aspiring to universal domination.

It is about this Marxian overturning of the Augustinian-Gregorian political economy and the current partial overturning of the Marxian political economy that I wish to make my main point, which I can only briefly state here.

IV The State and The Transcendent

This is the key issue of my paper. Does the State have or need any transcendent reference? Can the secular ^{realm} be self-sufficient in providing the principles of a political economy?

Plato, the spiritual father of the West did not think so. For him ¹² God is the beginning, the middle, and the end. Eternal justice is God's minister. Men who exalt themselves above this standard shall destroy themselves and their state. God is the measure of all things, not man, as some say.

What the Romans did was to reduce God to gods - little capricious powers who could be placated and from whom favours could be elicited by sacrifice. These gods Varro had defended as the foundation of Romanitas, and these gods the Christians had rejected. This reduction of God to gods one finds in Plato and ¹³ later neo-platonism as well. Plato, in The Laws

Plato, The Laws 715-716

857 ff.

Argues very strongly that a state ruled by those who have no sense of the Transcendent will be self-destructive

Augustine made that cruel and mis-leading opposition of man and God by positing two cities - one ~~Civitas~~ Civitas Dei, i.e. of God, and another the City of the Earth or the City of Man. In Book XV, Augustine makes the most unsophisticated and ^{misleading} polarisation: ~~distinction~~.

"That (human) race we have divided into two classes, one that lives according to man and the other that lives according to God.

In symbolic fashion we call these two cities, that is two communities of men, of which one is predestined to reign eternally with God, the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil." 14

Augustine's understanding of history is that it is the realm where the two cities co-exist i.e. "the faithless, worldly city", and the "heavenly city" which part of which is on earth as a pilgrim. The celestial city has nothing to do with ^{the} temporal laws of the earthly state; but does not break them. The heavenly city has its own peace, but respects the peace of the world:

Augustine, City of God: XV:I. Eng Tr.
J.W.C. Wand, London, OUP, 1963.

"... XIX: XVII

live by faith, seeks an earthly peace, and therein contains a civic harmony of command and obedience.... The heavenly city, on the other hand, or rather that part of it that is a stranger on the earth and lives by faith, also uses that peace because it must, until the mortality that makes it necessary shall itself pass away" 167 ✓

Despite this unjustifiable separation of the city of God and the city of Man, Augustine had established the principle of Transcendence, by positing the Divine as existing side by side with the human, in a ~~trans~~ tenuous and non-integral co-existence of the two cities. As Pope Gregory and his successors shaped the European state, the city of God, represented by the Papacy, came to have authority over the city of the Earth. What Europe did, to integrate the two ^{disjunct} cities of Augustine, was to place one under the other, and to derive the ^{civil} authority for the temporal state from God through the Pope. The Transcendent which hovered around the temporal in a somewhat loose way in

167 XIX:tvii - op. cit. p 348

Augustine, was ~~now~~ anchored inside the Temporal as supreme, by making the latter ^{State} also God-derived. The Prince was now no longer deriving his authority from the temporal State, but from the divine source through the Papacy.

V. The State as Representation

Eric Voegelin, in his The New Science of Politics¹⁸ argues that the government represents the State, which in turn represents the people, organized into a body for corporate action.

Representative here means both agent and image. Formerly kings used to represent the people and the State. Today institutions do that job. Voegelin says this is a peculiarity of Graeco-Roman and Western civilisations only - based on the prior articulation of the "individual" as a ~~rep~~ representable unit.¹⁹ This can be contested.

Voegelin says that in the great Far Eastern and Middle Eastern empires, this was not the case. These empires regarded themselves as representatives, or agents and images, not of the people, but of a transcendent divine order. He documents this from the Behistun Inscription, celebrating

18. University of Chicago Press, 1952

19. op.cit. p. 50

KUYUK

the feats of Darius I of Persia, who regarded himself as representative and tool of Ahuramazda. The Mongol King Kuyuk Khan wrote in the ^{13th} ~~14th~~ century to Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254), who invited the Khan to receive Christian baptism.

"If you say, 'I am a Christian; I adore God; I despise the others', How can ^{then} shall you know whom God ~~just~~ forgives and to whom He grants His mercy? How do you know that you speak such words? By the power of God, from the rising of the sun to its setting all realms have been granted to us. Without the Order of God, 19 How could anyone do anything?" 19

The Asian monarchs and emperors did not make any claim to derive their authority from the people or to represent them. They claimed to represent God. This seems to have been the case in medieval Christendom also, though in the Graeco-Roman tradition, especially in Athenian democracy, the people-representation claim had been made.

19. cited by E. Volgelin, *op. cit.* p. 57

What the modern, post-Enlightenment post-1789, western world has done is to reject the monarchic principle of God-representation, and replace it with the democratic principle of people-representation.

This democratic principle is only one strand in the western tradition. The Romanitas and Christianism traditions are clearly that of integrating the divine and the human in the social order. Augustine separated them, but they came back together again in medieval Christendom. In the Romanitas tradition the Pontifex is the bridge-builder between the divine and the human. Cicero recognizes this and in his De natura deorum philosophically justifies the divine-human nature of civil society, as the original situation until the charm was broken by the mysticism of the individual and ^{also the} ~~the~~ early secularisation of society. This was ^{the} ~~the~~ Greek society reflected in Homer and Hesiod - a community of close interaction between gods and humans. Even Alexander of Macedonia, who got his inspiration from the Persian Conquerors, was not a believer in Athenian democracy. Neither was that democracy totally secular. Alexander's

mentor, Aristotle, himself thought the rule of the many pretty bad, one is the Lord "20

The Christians did not de-divinize the social order; they only drove out the many gods of Rome, and put the one God of Jews and Christians in their place. Only gradually did the Triune ^{or the Christians} God take the place of the one God of the Jews as the author of law or civil order.

What Augustine or even him Pope Gregory did, was to de-divinize the civil order and to concentrate divinity in the ecclesiastical order — thus paving the way for the civil order to assert its total independence of the ecclesiastical order in the French Revolution, the Enlightenment and the process of secularisation.

20. Aristotle: Metaphysics 1076A

Eric Voegelin does not think that the secular order began with the French Revolution and the European Enlightenment of the 18th century. He thinks it began much earlier in a re-birth of Gnosticism. It was ^{western} Christianity which de-divinized the temporal order, by transferring divinity to the Church by St. Augustine.

But Charlemagne's Christendom built back the transcendent into the State, by the identification Romanitas = Christianitas = Christian Roman Empire of Charlemagne and his successors. The State was re-divinised by medieval Christendom; later assumed by Byzantium earlier, and after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, by Moscow, the Third Rome.

^{European} The Enlightenment, the French Revolution and the Process of Secularisation - all these marks a new de-divinisation of that which had been re-divinised. In that process, the transcendent is domesticated. The people take the place of the transcendent God as the ultimate source and authority for all power. This overthrow of the Transcendent in order to affirm the sovereignty of the Human is what undergirds both products of the European Enlightenment - ~~later~~ Democratic Liberalism and Marxism-Leninism.

In the common European Home, where Marxists and liberals are now to come together for a new programme of power-seeking and world domination, one doubts whether the old bourgeois tricks of the European Enlightenment will still work.

In Kant's small but powerful essay on "What is the Enlightenment?" he defines it as the assertion of adulthood by humanity, a humanity which only because of its timidity failed to come into its own inheritance as sovereign humanity. He, however, immediately goes on to say that such sovereignty can be exercised only by the "educated class", i.e. by middle class people with Bildung.

When the European Home people speak of a global Humanism, I suspect that in the back of their minds, they regard European humanity as the true adult humanity. They may be willing to recognize by painful necessity, the Americans and perhaps the Japanese also as nearing maturity. But the rest of humanity like Asia and Africa particularly, and also Latin America (which is largely
a period of

~ 1
mature enough, adult enough, to handle
the great responsibility of human
sovereignty.

Global humanism is principle
but in practice, however, only a part
of humanity, the technologically and
industrially advanced humanity can
exercise leadership of that humanity.
This principle is not always acknowledged
in theory, but is implied in much of
planning and action - in the economic
and political policies of all industrially
developed societies, including socialist
societies ^{like the USSR} and ex-socialist societies like
those of Eastern Europe. China does not
quite go along that line. ✓

V. The Secular and The Sovereignty of the People

I think both principles of European civilisation - the secular perspective on reality as self-existent and non-transcendent, and the affirmation of the sovereignty of the people which goes with the secular perspective - need thorough questioning and re-examination, before the principles on which ^{to found} a political economy can be formulated.

The secular assumption is one of the most famous assumptions made by European civilisation, which has fundamentally distorted all our ^{human} institutions including the State and the Academy. The dichotomisation of reality into sacred and secular was a direct consequence of Augustine's polarisation of the divine and the human.

(1804-1872)
~~Essence of Christianity~~ Feuerbach stated it in his own terms, when he denied Hegel's notion of the pre-existence of the Absolute Idea or other logical categories before material evolution began. He was right in stating that Hegel's Absolute Idea was a philosophical surrogate for

Friedrich Engels put it this way:

"With irresistible force Feuerbach is finally driven to the realization that the Hegelian pre-mundane existence of the Absolute Idea, the 'pre-existence of the logical categories' before the world existed, is nothing more than the fantastic survival of the belief in the existence of an extra-mundane creator; that the material, sensuously perceptible world to which we ourselves belong is the only reality." ³²²¹

The Feuerbachian reduction of the Transcendent to ~~the~~ be identical with the future of humanity lies at the heart of modern secular culture in both its forms - Marxism and Liberal Democracy.

No philosophy of political economy can really escape this fundamental issue. The immanentist eschatology i.e. the ^{claim that the} transcendence of God is identical with the 'future of humanity' has its background in European civilisation's desperate drive

²¹
30 Lewis S. Feuer, ed. Marx and Engels
" " " " Politics and Philosophy

to bring everything (including God) under the firm grip of its Cognitio. Hegel brought the Absolute Idea within human Cognition, and made that Cognition, in its final state, the final fulfilment of the Absolute Idea Itself, as it works out its potentiality into actuality in natural and human history.

In western civilisation we can trace three attempts to 'domesticate' God within the human - (a) the intellectual, ~~illustrated~~ exemplified by Hegel and Schelling, (b) the aesthetic-emotional, exemplified by Pentecostal sects, and (c) the volitional-activistic exemplified by Marxism ~~and~~ Liberal Democracy and National Socialism. Religious Fundamentalism keeps the transcendent as transcendent, but by making the religious leadership the custodians of the transcendent, makes another pernicious kind of domestication of the Transcendent possible. At the moment this tendency is very strong in many religions, but noticeably so in Iranian and Saudi Arabian Islam, in some forms of resurgent Hinduism, ~~in~~ Irish Roman Catholicism, Jewish Zionism, Khalistani Sikhism, ^{and} ~~in~~ Sri Lankan Buddhism, to cite a few of the more obvious fundamentalisms.

Subtler forms of this attempt to domesticate the Transcendent can be seen also in the varieties of self-understanding of various ~~expansionist~~ expansionist cultures: e.g. Moscow as Third Rome, America's Manifest Destiny and China's Celestial Kingdom, all of which are used to justify forms of ^{quest for} hegemony, imperialism and world domination.

Immanuel Kant, who in a philosophical sense is very much the Father and Prophet of the European Enlightenment, did not go as far as the domestication of the Transcendent in future human history, primarily because his basic standpoint was characteristically bourgeois and centred in the individual mind rather than in human history as a community experience.

Kant did this by refusing to yield the teleological principle of understanding nature to the ambitions of the mechanical-causal principle of modern science. For him the purposive ^{ness} of nature is an a priori concept²³, not one to be demonstrated by the empirical methods.

²² 31. See Kant, Critique of Judgment B. 204ff
Ed. Tr. J. H. Bernard. Macmillan, 2nd ed. revised,

of science. The purposiveness of nature is a transcendental deduction of the critique of judgment. And Kant insists that the order of nature cannot be understood without the a priori principle of purposiveness. The teleological judgment about the purpose of nature ^{as understood by us,} (or the purpose of the created order, if we speak in non-Kantian Christian theological terms) should form an integral part of any philosophy of political economy. For Kant this purposiveness can be understood only in a transcendental dimension:

"In other words, nature, considered as mere mechanism, could have produced its forms in a thousand other ways without stumbling upon the unity which is in accordance with such a principle. It is not in the concept of nature but quite apart from it that we can hope to find the ~~least~~ ground a priori for this" ³² 23 ✓

²³
~~32~~. 1. Kant, Critique of Judgment, op. cit.
p. 260.

It is reflection (for it is not a matter for empirical science) on this purposiveness of the whole that the European Enlightenment tradition has neglected. The result is that the purpose of the whole has been replaced by partial purposes of human communities like the establishment of national power, or imperium, or dominium terrae and so on. Liberal Democracy certainly operates on the pragmatic, arbitrary human choice of what a section of humanity wants. Marxism on the other hand defines the purpose of the whole as the establishment of the classless society, a stateless, creative, human community in history; ~~but~~ it thus does not, at least in theory, fall into the trap of making parochial pragmatism and provincialist greed for domination its final purpose.

But Marxism too has domesticated the transcendent purpose of the created order in accordance with a 19th century perception of the final goal of human history. Kant

character of the whole²⁴
the cause of the part as we understand
causality:

"To speak strictly..... the
organisation of nature has in
it nothing analogous to any
causality we know" ³⁴25 ✓

The point of Kant is that

- (a) Reason is not a mere mechanism
of nature;
- (b) Nature is not mechanical, but
a purposive entity which cannot
be understood apart from its
purpose; ~~Nature~~
- (c) Nature is a system of purposes,
and it is the function of Reason
to go beyond what Pure Reason can
do (i.e. scientific, mechanical-cause
explanation) to discern the nature
of the purposiveness of nature, and to
fulfil the creative human role within
it in imagination, creativity
and moral freedom.

Kant goes on then to

²⁴
33. op. cit p. 277-278
25 ³⁴ ibid. p. 280

formulate the two "constitutive principles of the possibility of Objects,"

Proposition All production of material things is possible according to merely mechanical laws;

counter-proposition: Some production of material things is not possible according to merely mechanical laws" ~~35~~ 26

The two principles seem to be in conflict, in contradiction, looking like an antinomy in Reason itself. Kant says, however, that it is not so, but that we should go along with the first principle as far as it takes. Beyond that we need a different principle for assessing final causes. This cannot be given by experience-based ~~the~~ use of pure reason; humanity needs to reflect.

And as humanity has reflected, according to Kant, two sets of systems have emerged - Idealism and Realism. These systems, do not, however,

∴ of cit p. 293

provide that which they pretend to. Kant ~~points out~~ ^{refers to} the system of Epicurus, who accepts the idea of purposiveness in nature but denies intentionality.

This is the system which Marx defended in his doctoral dissertation. Blind chance, or total randomness, is sufficient Cause to explain what looks like purposiveness in nature, according to Epicurus and Marx.

According to Kant Christian Theism, with the hylogism it implies, does not give the ^{philosophical} ground for purposiveness either; though it is superior to all other grounds of explanation^{27 36}, it still remains non-objective as a judgment³⁷. It cannot be proved, not even by a future Newton.

It is at this point that Kant goes beyond critical judgment to pure speculation. Culture, the creativity of human beings in accordance with chosen purposes, does not surrender its freedom to any a priori rules

as to how it should function. These choices of humanity are made, however, not primarily by an individual, but by the civil community which regulates the abuse of the conflicting freedoms of individuals.

The climax of Kant's argument is that ^{very existence of the} there is a final purpose for the world; ~~which is means~~ final purpose here means for Kant much more than what Aristotle put into that notion. A final purpose "needs no other as the condition of its possibility" §29, i.e. ~~if~~ the world exists because of its Idea — the idea of the highest good, in freedom. This final purpose is humanity, not as a phenomenon, but as a noumenon. Only human beings are capable of freedom in purposes, and so only in Man can the world achieve its purpose. This purpose of both world and humanity can exist only in an intelligent "World cause" (as highest artist); but such a First Cause is not open to Pure Reason; it is a fundamental a priori of human Consciousness. ✓

And here Kant provided a moral proof for the Being of God, a proof which has not stood the test of time and has therefore been largely abandoned. It was a subjective argument which Kant knew to be not logically compelling; it was an appeal which could find a positive response from a moral being, one who acknowledges ~~that~~ duties and responsibilities, and therefore a moral law to which one is bound by nature. A ^{morally} sensitive ~~man~~ ^{person} can recognize that the ground of the moral law ~~is~~ one observes in one's own nature is a divine Command.

Today we recognize how weak Kant's argument is. It comes at the end of his Third Critique, and almost seems like an appendix which Kant added to escape the charge of Atheism (or to please his servant who complained about Kant's Critiques doing away with God). The Fathers of the European Enlightenment did not want a secular perception of the world, i.e. the idea that the world can

entirely transcending it. Kant was not "secular" as ~~most~~ ^{many} children of the Enlightenment have become.

I am here concerned, not with the weakness or strength of Kant's arguments, nor with his personal beliefs. What I am concerned is the acceptance of the secular principle as the basis of modern western ~~celebration~~ civilisation. I can understand the historical circumstances under which the original ^{anti-secular} principle of the modern western state - i.e. cujus regio eius religio (as King, so religion) has been repudiated ^{and replaced by} the other western political principle of "separation of church and state". I can understand secularisation as a social, spiritual, intellectual process by which the domination of religion has been beaten back by the assertion of human freedom.

But I cannot understand the driving out of God from Academic Science (as not a 'necessary hypothesis') and from the State (secular state). If God is really the source and foundation of all existence, how can there be a science or state in which that source and foundation has no relevance?

Let me repeat - for me both the idea of the secular and the idea of the sovereignty of the people are ideas without foundation, mistaken ideas, based on arguments much weaker than the one ^{modern} advanced by Kant as moral argument for the existence of God. Science is foundationally wrong, in so far as it pretends to explain everything without reference to God, by positing a self-existent, auto-developing "nature" which it then proceeds to explain by its causal laws. The modern State, ~~is for~~ whether Marxist or liberal Democratic, is foundationally wrong, in so far as it affirms the principle of the Sovereignty of the people, because there is absolutely no evidence, either in practice or in theory, that the people ever have been or will be sovereign.

Conclusion

We ^{as humanity} are at a great crossroads. We need to understand the nature of the choices facing us.

In relation to what is happening and has happened in the Eastern part of Europe and in the Soviet Union, I can unhesitatingly make the following affirmations:

(a) The model of Marxist-Leninist socio-economic and political development initiated by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 has not stood the test of time

(b) What was previously condemned by Orthodox Marxism-Leninism as "bourgeois revisionism" is now becoming official doctrine for some socialist countries, including China and the Soviet Union..

(c) This does not mean a ^{total} discounting of the socialist experiment; some values established in socialism are now becoming ^{increasingly} normative even for market economies, e.g. a full ^{imperative} need to make

L4

food, housing, clothing, work, education, health, communication and transport ^{equally equitably} accessible to all ^{according to need -} people, whatever their economic and social status, geographical location, or religions, ~~and~~ ~~political~~ ideological and political convictions. Social justice has been demonstrated to be a goal to be pursued in all societies. People have become aware of the moral condemnability of oppression ~~and~~, exploitation and great inequalities in standard of living. No political philosophy ^{today} can afford to ignore these basic norms.

(d) The triumph of market economy capitalism is extremely temporary. ^{Faced with} Because of the presence and challenge of socialism, the market economy system has developed highly sophisticated ways of overcoming crises. But the contradictions of capitalism are intrinsic, and the system is bound to collapse by the weight of its ~~own~~ internal contradictions, sooner

is quite substantial and in the countries of Eastern Europe, where the knowledge of the market economy has been from a distance, ~~the~~ Capitalism has won millions of open supporters. It also has received an enormous boost by the opening up of new ~~new~~ investment and market possibilities in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and China. It can go on for a while, even if there is no substantial increase in military budgets of nations.

- ② By dint of sheer historical necessity new economies will develop which are mixtures of some socialist principles and practices ^{mixed} with prominent market economy features. Only the proportion of socialist and capitalist elements will vary in these new economies as well as the ~~older~~ ~~can~~ established economies like those of U.S.A, Germany and Japan, as well as the E.C.
- . . . thing of the past

~~Future~~ socialism is still a thing of the future.

(f) The challenge that shows no signs of being met is to create new models of political economies based on our present insights about the nature of the world as process and of human beings in it. It may take quite a while before the incipient questioning of the values of the European Enlightenment, the mechanistic, ^{and largely anti-human} paradigm of scientific-technological development, and the fatuous ^{and} fallacious ~~seci~~ secular assumption will lead to the devising of totally new political economic models. Pushing that questioning to some creative levels is the present challenge before a philosophy of political economy

Political Power and the Power of the Cross. (Bishop Paul Grosvenor)

The Bible uses two or more words to denote power. It is conceivable that a good bit of our confusion arises from our equivocation in this respect.

The word 'authority' is often translated power in English. When Jesus says that the Son of Man has 'power' to forgive sins (Mt 9:6; Mk 2:10; Lk 5:24), or when Pilate says that he has power to release him or crucify him ^{for the} ~~the~~ (Jn 19:10) the ^{Greek} word used is exousia, which is better translated authority. It is authority to exercise power, to give orders which will be carried out.

The other word in Greek is ~~also~~ dynamis, also translated 'power'. The Greek usage denotes an actual manifestation of the capacity to execute something, not simply to give orders, but in fact to ~~carry out~~ ^{achieve} an intention. But it is also a form of energy as for example when the Angel announces to Mary that the power of the Most High would overshadow her in order to bring forth the Messiah; (Lk 1:35) or when the Synoptics say that power came forth from him to heal the sick (Mk 5:30, 6:19, Lk 5:17 etc.) Even some of the acts of such power are themselves called dynamis, as, e.g. when S. Matthew says that "Jesus did not do many 'powers' there" (Mt 13:58[±], Mk 6:5 etc.)

Jesus Christ was powerless in the sense that he had no political power. In fact he seems to ~~to~~ have not only shunned political power, but in fact to have regarded seeking to save the world through political power as his major temptation.

The temptation begins already at the beginning of his public ministry. The ~~first~~ ^{second} temptation of Jesus in the wilderness experience as narrated by St. Luke is clearly of this kind. (Lk 4:5 ff). The Devil shows him all the kingdoms of this world in an instantaneous vision, and offers to Jesus the authority over the whole inhabited earth in return for Jesus' submission to the Devil. Jesus does not question the Devil's claim that all political power belongs to the Devil by virtue of a gift from God (Lk 4:6).

Obviously Christ's way to the salvation of the world was ~~not~~ ^{far from} the gaining of political and economic power in order to establish a just and equitable society of peace. His way ~~was~~ led through the Cross and Resurrection. And whenever anyone told Jesus that that was not the way, he heard the words of the Devil: "Get thee behind me, Satan. You are a ~~temptation~~ ^{tempter} ~~in~~ ^{cause of} stumbling for me" was said to the Great St Peter ^{precisely} because he sought to counsel Jesus away from the way of the Cross.

But the powerlessness of Jesus was accompanied by tremendous manifestations of power of a different kind, which we lack today.

The contrast between political or imperial power and the power of the Kingdom emerges also in Jesus' charming dialogue with Pilate in the Johannine narrative. Here Jesus does not question the authority of Pilate when the latter claims that he has authority to release or to crucify. In fact Jesus explicitly recognizes the power of Pilate as God-given (Jn 19:11). Both the Devil and Pilate have been given political power by God!

But Jesus says that his kingship is not the kind that uses the power that comes from the barrel of a gun (Jn 18:36). His throne is, the cross, and mine is the inscription "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews". It is a kingship that lays down its life and bears witness to the truth (Jn 18:37).

Palm Sunday was clearly an occasion when Jesus could have made a bid for political power. The demonstration spontaneously set up by the Jews who had come to the feast in Jerusalem was clearly a political one. "Hosanna to the Son of David" is a political slogan welcoming a Messianic King who goes to war against the enemies of the Kingdom. "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" is a political slogan welcoming the King of Israel in his triumphant procession into Jerusalem.

It is not too far-fetched to conjecture that the "Greeks" who came to see Jesus

immediately after the successful political demonstration of Palm Sunday had ~~also~~ ~~a~~ ~~for~~ collaboration in a political annexation in mind. "Sir, we wish to see Jesus" is a cryptic phrase in which the Fourth Evangelist gives expression to the offer of the Gentiles from Galilee, to be communicated to Jesus through the two disciples with Greek names Philip and Andrew, who are also Galileans (S. John 12:20ff). The response of Jesus is also characteristic. The only way to the Kingdom is through death and resurrection. Unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone. Only by dying it can bear fruit. Precisely at that point Jesus hears again the voice of the Devil tempting him to take the path of political power to his messiahship - "Father, save me from this hour", he forgoes (S. John 12:27).

* * *

We should pay special attention to this problem today, when we are also as Christians tempted to save the world through political and economic power. Disillusionment is bound to set in, sooner or later. Governments are not going to save the world, and we Christians should not forget that basic fact. All I intend to do ~~in this paper~~ ^{in this paper} is to raise a few questions for further study.

① When we speak of power, are we putting the power to forgive sins and political power on the same level? Christ gave authority to his disciples - to forgive sins, to heal, to cast out demons. Is this the same kind of power as the power to run a political, economic system which also helps people to live with each other, to run hospitals and schools, and to remove the demonic manifestations of injustice? Is there a basic difference between the power of the Apostles and the power of the political and economic decision makers?

② When we speak of power and powerlessness, do we recognize the fact stunning fact that the political powerlessness of Jesus was more than compensated by the astounding spiritual power that he wielded? When we talk of the powerlessness of the poor or of Christians, do we recognize the fact that unlike in the case of Jesus, this political powerlessness of ours is not accompanied by the spiritual power that gave such strength and authority to Jesus? Do we not suffer from a double powerlessness, the absence of both kinds of power both political and spiritual? Is not ours a dead powerlessness, unlike the powerlessness of the Son of God? Is it not better to have political and economic power at least rather than lacking both kinds of power?

(3) Do we recognize the fact that when such spiritual power is actually developed, as in the case of a Martin Luther King, or a Mahatma Gandhi, even while not holding any assigned role in the political and economic structure, both King and Gandhi ~~not wielded~~ ^{could wield} enormous political power? Which most of the rest of us do not seem to have? Is this political power that King and Gandhi wielded not akin to the political power which Christ himself wielded and which threatened both the Imperial Power of Rome and the ecclesiastical power of the Jews? Is this not the road for Christians to take in relation to the racial struggle also? While we do not run away from political power as such, it is not primarily by edging our way into the political and economic structure that we are going to bring about justice. Should it not rather be that while remaining disengaged from the political power structure, we challenge the unjust power structure in a more fundamental way by standing in a loose relation to it and by at the same time developing an alternate spiritual power such as Jesus, Gandhi and King had at their disposal?

(4) The struggle for power and racial equality on the part of the powerless and the disinherited has thus to take on a double aspect - that of fighting the oppressive power, and that of developing one's own spiritual power. If it ^{is} ~~is~~ only a question of fighting the enemy's power, then the thing to do ~~is~~ ^{is} would be to seek to develop one's political-economic power ^{of the oppressed} to the point where we ~~are~~ ^{can} crush the enemy's power. But long before ~~we~~ ^{the oppressed} reach that point the enemy, whose power remains superior, is likely to crush ~~us~~ ^{them}. On the other hand, if the kind of power we are developing is spiritual power, then the enemy will all his economic and political power will not be able to suppress that power in the process of its development. For economic and political power is not capable of crushing spiritual power. And when spiritual power grows to a certain point, it becomes unafraid of economic and political power, and in fact can overthrow it, even if such overthrowing may come only through martyrdom or death and resurrection.

If this is the case, then we as ~~Christian~~ ^{the} oppressed ought to develop our spiritual power, the power of the Cross, the power of the Kingdom, which alone is finally capable of challenging and overthrowing the superior might of the oppressor. A Theology of the Powerless therefore has to be clear about its strategy. Jesus himself was politically powerless, but it was not the simple

fact of his powerlessness that led him to victory. It was his access to a different kind of power, ~~the~~ call it spiritual power, the power of the kingdom, the power of the cross, or the power of God - that finally leads to the triumph over darkness and evil.

This applies to the ~~white~~ ^{colored} man as well as to his victim. The white man too need not feel so helpless in his powerlessness if he has the sincerity and honesty to dedicate himself to the search for kingdom power, which comes only through disengagement from the existing power structures.

Power does not mean simply the ability to control, to coerce, to manipulate to have one's way. It could also mean the power to give life and the power to endure. Prayer itself is a form of ~~power~~ power. So is true renunciation. Ultimately the strongest power is that of love. A love that cares not for itself, but lays down its life for others. This is indeed the power that alone is enriched, in the last analysis, to hold all other forms of power - including the power of knowledge and the power of technology as well as the power of money, and the power to control others.

Without overcoming our attachment to our own selves no ~~power~~ the real power of the cross does not become accessible to us. That is also the meaning of Christ's words, apropos the visit of the Gentile delegation and their

before about making a bid for political power by organizing the masses for political revolution.

"Amen, Amen, I say to you. For the wheat seed, if it refuses to fall into the ground, must remain alone and unproductive. ^{only if it falls} and dies can it bear much fruit. To love one's own self is to lose it, and only he one who dares to lay down his life in this world really manages to conserve it for eternal life."

Where can we look for this power - the power to die creatively, to die in love, in order that life may come out of death? That certainly is not to be found in the realm of economic and political power, but it is the power of the cross that finally triumphs - even in racial relations. It is folly for the oppressed to merely grasp the power of the oppressor. That power, when grasped, may turn to be the enemy. It is a different kind of power that we seek, which liberates us from the fear of the oppressor, and can finally also liberate the oppressor.

RED GOVERNMENT AND GREEN REVOLUTION IN KERALA

(R Paul Verghese)

I am not quite sure why you have asked me to address you on this subject. That you are interested in the problems of the developing countries I can understand. But why Kerala? Many of you may not know much about this small state on the west coast of South India, born as a state on 1st November 1956, about 1/5 the size of Sweden, with a population of ~~18~~ 18 million! Its land area is just 1.27% of the whole of India. Its population is 4% of the total of India. The density of population, 435 per sq.km, is the highest among the Indian states, three times the Indian average which is already one of the highest in the world. The per capita income in the state is about Rs. 400/- or U.S. \$ 53.33, or Swed. cr.266 a year (^{22.50}~~21.5~~ crowns a month) a year. The average income of an Indian in Kerala is about 15 cents U.S. a day!

And we have a million people totally unemployed in our little state. You know sometimes we get pretty desperate. On 5th April 1957, 12 years ago, we elected a totally communist Government to power in our State by fully democratic methods without any semblance of a violent revolution. In a fully free election, the first in the new state of Kerala, the Communist Party won 65 Assembly seats (including 5 independents) out of a total of 126, while the Congress, Nehru's party won only 43 seats.

Of course our first Government, the Red Government, did not last long. That was mainly the job of our dog-collar politicians (Cassock politicians, we are called in Kerala) - the clergy of the Christian churches. You see about a fourth of the people of Kerala are Christians. They are not very rich. Neither are they the poorest class. Most of them are white collar workers, the lower middle class, to which I myself belong.

The middle classes in Kerala had always managed to keep the agricultural and industrial working classes down on the social and economic scale. With the coming to power of the communist party, this picture began to change.

The establishment, which includes the landed gentry, the clergy and the capitalist class, decided to bring down the communist Government. In June 1959 they launched a "liberation campaign" in Kerala". The Roman Catholic Church took a leading role in the liberation struggle. Money flowed from abroad and from the capitalist classes to support the fight against the communist party. The churches trained "volunteers" arming them with crow-bars and bamboo spears to fight the communists.

Nehru's central Government was waiting for the opportunity. As unrest grew in the state, on 31st July 1959, the communist Government in Kerala was dismissed by the President of India. The President took over direct rule in the state.

The next election in 1960 was a dramatic blow to the communists. Out of 126 seats, they could gain only 29 seats, while the Congress, Muslim League, Praja-Socialist Party coalition took 94 seats.

This strong coalition has now completely broken up. The Congress has again split into two, giving birth to a new reactionary party called the Kerala Congress. The socialist parties as well as the communist parties have also broken up and fragmented.

Today we have in Kerala an unusual number of political parties. The present government in Kerala is a coalition of seven political parties, led by the two communist parties. The more radical leftist communist party has the largest representation in the Assembly holding 52 seats out of 133. The right communist and the Socialist Party come next with 19 seats each. The Muslim League representing 3 million Kerala Muslims have 14 seats. These four parties, along with three small parties, namely the Revolutionary Socialist Party (6 seats), the Kerala Socialist Party, the Agricultural Labour Party, form the present Government of Kerala. In the opposition is the Indian National Congress with 9 seats, the splinter group the Kerala Congress with 5 seats and some 6 independents some of whom support the Government.

Our second Red Government is then a somewhat funny red. It includes the communal and conservative Muslim League and the Roman Catholic agricultural labour party. But the vast majority are not socialists of various shades of pink and red.

They have been in power now for two years. How does this democratically elected communist Government function within the democratic constitution of the Federal Government of India?

Is it wise for the Central Government to allow a communist government ~~of~~ to function freely within itself? Is not the centre inviting subversion and revolution from within by letting the Kerala Government continue in power? These may be one set of questions you may want to ask me. And I shall try to answer them to the best of my knowledge.

The second set of questions ^{are} you ^{may} want to ask me ^{one} perhaps the following.

How does such a state Government work? Have they done any good for the state? What ~~a~~ sort of harm have they done?

The communist party coming to power by democratic methods in this most literate, and most Christian of all Indian states, is a puzzle to many. I can advance at least four reasons for this development.

First we have a social set-up which is ^s basically communal. Our ~~class~~ division has not always been between capitalist and labourer, or between ~~a~~ landlord and peasant. We have three main groups who have been economically warring against each other for centuries - the high caste Hindus, the low-caste Hindus, and the Christians. It is only in recent times that the Muslims have become economically and politically alive. The High Caste Hindus and the Christians have vied with each other to dominate the economy and to keep political power. The low-caste Hindus and a large ^e segment of poor Muslims formed the exploited group. They were the labourers, the landless peasants, the "coolies"

It is among this exploited group of lower caste Hindus and Muslims that the communist party has had its greatest influence.

The fact that ~~is~~ is the most literate state in India helped here. The poorer classes went to school, because everybody else did. There their minds were quickened. They began reading newspapers and the liberally ^a supplied communist propaganda. Their political awareness became ^{me} acute and informed. They began to revolt against their exploiters. Thus the two major factors that contributed to the communist party coming to power were the communal ^a triangle in which two communities competed with each other in exploiting a third, and secondly the high ^{rate} ~~rate~~ of literacy and the easy availability of education to the oppressed ~~xx~~ classes.

The two other reasons are also connected with the literacy factor. The consequence of unplanned educational expansion in the state in response to popular demand, was large scale educated unemployment. The Churches bear a great deal of responsibility

for having provided all that education. The British missionaries (Church Missionary Society) began the process by starting a few high schools and colleges owned by the church. The Roman Catholic Church soon took over from them, and found schools an excellent method to gain easy conversions and to keep its foot in the establishment. Other churches like mine followed suit. When Christians began developing a large number of educational institutions Hindus and Muslims felt they had to do likewise. Thus the idea of privately owned educational institutions snow-balled, and to day 60% of education in Kerala is in private hands.

The high demand for education came from the hope of economic advancement. The rich and the poor alike sent their children to school and college. Every village of any size began having its own university college. All those who were educated wanted to have salaried jobs, and ofcourse the number of jobs available always fell short of the number of educated people. Thus educated unemployment mounted in an unprecedented way, leading to large scale frustration and social unrest. The structure of society which was unable to provide a living for all the educated became unpopular. The Communists exploited this unrest, and became the only hope of changing these structures.

Christian preaching, which spoke about justice and welfare, had ^{se} roused the conscience of many educated people against the injustice of a society which could not give a living wage or employment to large numbers of its population. But neither the Christian Church nor the congress party had any programme or strategy to deal with the economic structures of society. Thus intellectuals also began to become revolutionary and they could find no other instrument than the communist party with which to change society. Communist ideology thus spread among intellectuals, both Christian and non-christian.

A fourth factor was the presence of large scale mass corruption in the political parties of the establishment, especially Nehru's Congress party. Bribery and nepotism, ^{and} misappropriation of state funds, began to spread in the Government. There was no Congress leader in the state who combined ability with integrity. This made large numbers of the middle class who had no particular liking for communist ideology become anti-congress. Meanwhile there was division and schism within the congress party itself. New parties began to take shape. The communists never gained more than 35% of the votes, but because the remaining 65% of votes were divided among five or six different warring parties, the communists were able to get elected in many constituencies.

It is interesting to note that in the 1967 elections, the two communist parties together got only 32% of the votes, but secured 53% of the seats. The two congress parties on the other hand gained 43% of the votes, but only 10% of the seats. In a possible new election, if only the two Congress parties would themselves unite and seek the cooperation of the socialist parties, they could easily gain the majority in the assembly. But they are unable to do so primarily due to want of enlightened and honest leadership among them.

What prevents the centre from removing the communist coalition from power in the state? In fact, after having been in power for two years, the communist parties would like to be kicked out from the seat of power. Only that way can they become martyrs and gain the sympathy of the voters in the next election. The problems of Kerala are practically insoluble and any Government which stays in power for a long time is bound to become unpopular for not having dealt with the problem of educated and uneducated unemployment. If the Congress comes to power, they will also soon become unpopular. So the Central Government refuses to take precipitate action. They expect the Communist Government to fall by the weight of its own inertia, and contents itself by failing to give adequate financial assistance to the state. All the new industries in India, both Government owned and private are being located in other states, on the plea that the labour force in the state is communist controlled and therefore unreliable. This helps only to make the problems of Kerala mix more and more insoluble, for without large scale industrial investment, the problem of unemployment cannot be solved.

X X X X X

Meanwhile what is the Communist coalition in the state achieving? Are they trying to deal with the economic problems of the state? The answer is, basically, no. Why? In the first place, the state government does not get much cooperation from the centre, in the allocation of industrial investment, as we have already already noted. Secondly, private capital is also not interested in investing in the state because of a fear of labour unrest. Thirdly, there is strong difference of opinion among the communists themselves as to the basic strategy to be followed.

The right communists (Moscow-oriented as some would wrongly label them) want genuine economic development in the state, and would not be averse to seeking to bring in capital from Eastern European countries or even from Japan. But they are a minority in the Government, and are strongly opposed by the left communist party (Peking-oriented, some would wrongly label them).

which alone can ultimately solve the problem of the whole of India and of mankind. They would therefore be interested in giving more privileges to the poor peasant and the labourer, even at the expense of disrupting the economy. They appoint more and more of their sympathisers to existing and newly created Government and corporation jobs. Thus they both secure the sympathy of the masses and at the same time manage to infiltrate the government with communists in the interests of a future revolution. Government has now become the biggest white elephant in the country, consuming more than 56% of the total budget of the state. One cannot get a job today in Government without paying a huge bribe which comes to several years salary. This bribe, or at least most of it, goes not into individual pockets, but into the coffers of the left communist party.

Thus the basic strategy of the left communist party to which the Chief Minister belongs and which controls the present government seems to be as follows:

- (a) Give as many favours as possible to the poorer classes and thereby win their support for the future revolution.
- (b) Pack the economy with an insupportable number of employees who are paid high wages and thus help the economy to crumble totally, then paving the way for revolution.
- (c) Sell as many favours for as high a price as possible, so that when the revolution comes the communist party will be rich enough to challenge all forces in the state.
- (d) link up with West Bengal, the North Eastern state, to gradually take over the central government in the name of a United Front; if this is not possible, create a revolutionary ferment in the whole country during which the Party can take over power by revolutionary methods.
- (e) meanwhile break the power of the main enemies of the Communist Party - namely the Christian Church with all its schools and the Hindu religious establishment which is equally conservative and anti-communist.

They have already begun to put into operation the last part of the strategy. They have managed to put through the Assembly two pieces of legislation which would authorize the Government to control the management and the appointment of personnel to private educational institutions, as well as to take over High Schools and Colleges on charges of mis-management. The bishops of Kerala - 34 of them belonging to four different churches, the Roman Catholic, the Orthodox the Mar Thoma and the Church of South India, have joined together to contest this legislation as a violation of the national constitution and as an infringement on minority rights granted by

the constitution. If they do not succeed in Court, they may launch mass public demonstration against the Communist Government. It was this organized opposition by the Church that led to the downfall of the state government in 1959. Whether the trick will work again in 1970 remains to be seen. The influence of the bishops has become much less now than it was a decade ago, because of the prevalence of large-scale corruption in Christian educational institutions.

X X X X

The new Communist Party.

What has the communist led state government accomplished in these last two years? According to the Government, it has a dozen objectives;

- (1) To raise the per capita income of Kerala to the level of the national per capita income of India by 1984. In 1964-65 it was Rs. 423 for India and Rs. 391/ for Kerala. By 1984, the Indian per capita income is hoped to be Rs 769/- or about U.S. \$ 1.00 per annum and Kerala would like to reach the same level at least.
- (2) To assure that the benefits of economic growth are more equitably distributed among the poorer classes.
- (3) to pay special attention to certain districts in Kerala which lag behind the rest of the state in economic development.
- (4) to reduce the level of unemployment by creating new jobs and work opportunities.
- (5) to reduce the food deficit in the state and to lay plans for attaining self-sufficiency in food within the state.
- (6) to increase the productivity of the land by greater encouragement to cash crops and by bringing new areas under cultivation.
- (7) to compensate for the disadvantages created by the fluctuation in price of primary commodities exported to the world market from the state, and to struggle for price stabilisation in the export trade market.
- (8) to develop the fishing industry in the state on a long-term plan
- (9) to enable maximum exploitation of the water resources

industries and mining

(12) to develop further the social services like Education, health and social welfare.

The achievements todate of the Kerala Government in most of these areas are far from remarkable. Only in the matter of food production there has been considerable progress. Under the guidance and patronage^a of the Central Government, the Kerala Government has undertaken measures for improving food production in a state which is very far down in the level of food self-sufficiency, owing to the unusual density of population and shortage of arable land.

The years 1967 and 68 have seen substantial increase in the total food production of the country^a as well as the state. The use of chemical fertilizers, new varieties of high-yield seed, and greater use of irrigation have been the main factors, combined with favourable weather conditions. Kerala has 1.3 million acres of land under rice cultivation. In 1967-68 the production was 1.124 million tons. In 1968-69 it has risen to 1.5 million tons. Kerala needs at least 2 million tons of rice for the present population.

The more optimistic observers believe that the agricultural revolution, which means use of fertilizers, better seeds and irrigation, can now to be carried through to provide food self-sufficiency for the whole country. This is ~~the~~ what is now journalistically known as the Green Revolution. But two factors still threaten the success of the Green Revolution. First is the uncertainty of rainfall, flood and draught conditions. In 1968-69 the conditions were favourable and ~~the~~^s accounts largely for the higher productivity. But what guarantee is there that the Gods of the weather will always be on the side of the Green Revolution? Government has achieved better flood control facilities as well as improved storage and distribution. But Government cannot control rainfall. So long as the major portion of Indian agriculture is dependent on rain-water rather than ^{on} irrigation this uncertainty will continue to plague food production.

The second factor is that of the price of agricultural commodities. The acute shortage of 1965 and 1966 led to high prices for ~~good~~^{good} grains. This in turn encouraged farmers to invest more by way of fertilizers and high-yielding seeds to increase their production. But the higher production of 1968-69 has already led to the prices going down; and it becomes increasingly less profitable for the farmer to raise his yield per acre. Unless the Government can subsidize heavily fertilizers and better seeds, the Green Revolution will fizzle out.

The problem is made even more acute by the demands of agricultural labour for higher wages. Large-scale mechanization of farming is practically impossible under present Indian conditions of fragmentation, surplus of labour force and absence of agricultural capital.

It is too early to be optimistic about the success of the Green Revolution, either in Kerala or in India as a whole.

We are becoming convinced that ^{the} social structure within a country is just as important as ^{and economic} international political relations. No lasting solution to our problems can be found within existing social structures, for ^{the} the problems of price and wage control, and distributive justice call for radical political measures.

Conclusion.

Fifteen years ago, I used to be rather confident that the basically democratic orientation of the people of India is the assurance against a communist government in India. Today I am not so sure. The democratic pattern has shown so many weaknesses, that an increasingly larger number of intellectuals in the country see no other alternative to a fully controlled economy, where the goals of national production and cultural development are pursued with determination and discipline by a strongly socialist government.

At present, communal and capitalist elements are increasing their power, and there is a visible shift to the right in the political structure. There is large-scale disillusionment about the capacity of a wishy-washy mixed economy to deal with the problems of the nation. A small minority, mainly intellectuals, turn to the left in their disillusionment. Larger numbers, ^{and} are led by the capitalist and communalist elements, are pleading for a strong rightist government such as exists in Greece today, oppressively moralist and religious, with strict central control, and ^a more openly capitalist economy.

If this happens, as well it may, the minority communities, mainly Muslims and Christians, as well as the more politically aware of the worker and peasant classes, ^{and} as well as many more intellectuals, would be driven to the left.

We have learned a few lessons from our Kerala experience which may have some significance for you in Sweden.

1. The first discovery is that ~~practical~~ problems like food shortage in India cannot be solved in isolation from structural questions about price-control, farm subsidies, industrial development etc. There is still the hope entertained that the Green Revolution in India as a whole will work. It remains very much to be seen,

and to make sure that no one is crushed or left out in the cold by the system.

2. We have discovered that political parties all become aged in time. No political party seems to be capable of remaining in power for a long time, and still to have the imagination and the vitality necessary to create new social and economic realities. Power develops a machine which tries to perpetuate itself, and loses sight of the problems ^{and} of the needs of the people for whose sake the power was entrusted to them. We have not yet found the machinery to ensure that political and economic power is always responsibly used.

3. We are discovering that politics, by its very process of love of power, generates an atmosphere which drives away the best minds in the country from coming near it. It is not that we do not have good men in India. But the democratic power machinery does not allow the really good man to come to the top. Its ruthless methods, and its undue dependence on the ^votes of the emotionally swayed people who are more interested in their own private interests than in the interests of the whole nation or of mankind, makes it difficult for the man with a wider vision to get enough public support. The solution for this is of course not ^untocracy or aristocracy, but a more enlightened public. Disinterested non-party political and education of the masses is an immediate necessity.

4. We have discovered that the pattern ^{of} socialism that have worked in a country like Sweden, are inapplicable to our situation for two reasons.

- (a) lack of homogeneity and the heavy weight of the past
- (b) a mentality that turns to selfish interests in a deficiency economy

e.g. nationalized industries ^{lead} to bureaucratic overweight we cannot produce ~~cheaply~~ any more cheaply any more despite our cheap labour, *due to inefficient management*

5. The need for a type of democracy which ^hdisciplines people to work. Too much of freedom to form political parties, to run away ^{even} from any team for some slight difference of opinion, cannot lead to the development of an effective party structure. We need less - temporarily at least - of the freedom of speech and association and more of the capacity to work and to submit oneself to the discipline of a team committed to larger social purposes.

6. We have discovered that the problems of Kerala cannot be solved piece-meal in Kerala. The economics of the whole world are

inter-connected. Even a non-colonial nation like Sweden participates in, and flourishes on an exploitative world economy. Your coffee and some of your raw materials are the product of our cheap labour, for which, even if you pay a fair price, the lion's share goes to your traders and ours. The prices of our primary commodities do not go up at the same ^{pace} level as that of your manufactured commodities. The trade between the developed and developing countries is a process by which the poor countries ^{are} being impoverished and ^{the} rich further enriched. While on the short run some of these injustices can be partly remedied by better price structures and trade terms, ultimately and in the long run only international political and economic structures can begin to build a just society in the world.

The resources of the world ^{have} been given to the whole of mankind. No sector of mankind can build a private paradise and dwell securely in it. Such private paradises are themselves blatant signs of injustice, when there exists miserable poverty in other parts of mankind.

These problems are not going to be solved by all the law and the order and liberal wishful thinking we have got at present. Those who hold the reins of economic power in the world will not let go so easily. The military industrial ^e complexes rule the world with the aid of the international and national banking interests.

There is no world-wide state with executive power to which one can effectively appeal for justice. The shape of the world tomorrow, and the cause of justice and peace in the world, depend to a large extent, on the creation of a viable, responsible, powerful, democratic, socialist world state.

SHOULD A THIRD FRONT BEGIN NOW?

REFLECTIONS ON SOME ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION.

(Paul Gregorios)

1. The number of those who cannot in conscience align themselves either with the Janata Coalition Party or an opposition led by Mrs. Gandhi is on the increase every day. The latter's victory in Chimagalur has forced open the issue of a third alternative.

2. Such a third alternative has been proposed by several people in the form of a Third Front of progressive people committed to a Socialist future for India. But neither the platform nor the practicality of such a Front is very clear. This paper tries to put down a few preliminary thoughts.

3. Of course, we will need to make clear what we mean by a Socialist future for India. The slogan of "democratic socialism" seems common to all existing political parties and groups including perhaps the Jan Sangh and the Rashtriya Svayam Sevak Sangh. The Kerala Congress, for example, has articulated the features of a desirable economy as "a people's socialism which while eliminating the disadvantages of Communism (state capitalism) and Capitalism (private capital) ensures the advance of the working class" (Margarekha of Kerala Congress). Both the Janata Party and the existing Congress parties are verbally committed to similar ideals. Wherein would the specific commitment of the proposed Third Front lie?

4. The Third Front would have a socio-economic programme worked out in some detail, along with a plan for its achievement, which will be theoretically sound and practically feasible. But in order to ensure a wider range of agreement and commitment, certain controversial ideological points may have to be left unformulated.

5. The attractiveness of such a front would come not merely from the clarity and progressiveness of the formulated platform and programme. It will need also a quality of discipline and social commitment manifest in its activities.

6. The first of these self-disciplines for the Third Front would be to make a decision that it will not seek to take state power at the Centre or in the States for a period of six years, during which period it will devote its energies to

- Corporations*
- a) social vigilance about activities of Governments, mass media and other large concentrations of economic, communicational, social and political power;
 - b) the building up of Cadres for activating self-reliant, disciplined, informed organizations of the people, directly in the context of the relations of production;
 - and c) socio-economic measures which advance the fair and just co-ordination between rural and urban development as well as micro-development and macro-development, within states, among States within the nation and ~~xx~~ among the nations of the world, measures which promote peace justice and self-reliance at all levels.

7. The minimum commitment within the Third Front would be to the following principles:

a) The basic approach in theory would be an integrative one - political economy must inter-relate the political-economic, sociological and scientific technological experience and insights of mankind, for devising methods for optimizing human development in justice, liberty and peace.

8. The commitment is to a society where the means of production are socially owned and controlled, while guaranteeing the inviolability of limited and legitimate personal freedom and property; a society which provides everyone with the opportunity to do socially useful

work and to live a life in dignity and freedom, in security and peace, a society in which inequalities are minimised, and the freedom and dignity of each person is promoted;

- c) The commitment is to a society where agricultural, industrial culture and ecological development would be planned in an integral way; while development has to be labour-extensive in present conditions, technological progress is also to be aimed at simultaneously in order to increase production. The advance in technology is as much a measure of progress as the volume of goods and services produced, but always in order to promote the quality of human life and to improve the human environment.

8. We have kept the areas of common commitment to a minimum. The above is proposed only as a starting point for discussion. A more well thought out common platform can be worked out with just a day's work, with half a dozen ~~expert~~ competent people representing various views.

9. One of the first steps is to plan a week-end meeting, preferably in Delhi, but alternatively in Kerala, to explore the possibilities and assess the practicalities. Such a third front may bring together political parties, voluntary organizations and private individuals who are willing to accept the common basis and a commonly agreed discipline.

10. Within such a framework of commitment, there will be room for ideological divergence at many points of detail. The common commitment, however, must lead to a common programme of social, political and economic action. The orientation of ~~the State, but~~ such action will not be to gain control of the State, but to mobilize and channel the power of the people for their own liberation. There will be room in such a coalition for people of the middle-classes and

intellectuals of various kinds, provided they are committed to the interests of the people and their emancipation, ~~rather~~ rather than conserving the interests of the middle classes.

x

x

x

11. The Question is: Is now the opportune time to form a Third Front of this kind? The answer is yes, because

a) the two major options in current politics are both unsatisfactory and people are looking for a third alternative;

b) Young people are becoming cynical for want ^{of} a ray of hope: something genuinely capable of capturing their interest and sustaining their idealism needs to be provided now, if they are not to sink further into cynicism, nihilism and anarchism.

The present document is intended only as an indicator of a general basis on which people from different political parties and from no political party can come together to explore possibilities. The exploratory group themselves will have to formulate their understanding of what needs to be done, and decide on the steps to be taken for the launching of a flexible but clear programme.